

Tokugawa Intellectual History and Prewar Ideology: The Case of Inoue Tetsujirō, Yamaga Sokō, and the Forty-Seven *Rōnin*

John Allen Tucker

East Carolina University

Western accounts of Yamaga Sokō (山鹿素行, 1622-1685) and his *shidō* 士道, or samurai philosophy, often observe, rather uncritically, that Sokō was the teacher of the forty-seven Akō *rōnin* 赤穂浪人.¹ In doing so, they echo one of the most frequently repeated national myths of pre-1945 Japan. Of course, the claim adds color to any account of Sokō, already one of the most sensational thinkers of Tokugawa Japan (1600-1868). In 1666, the *bakufu*, led by Hoshina Masayuki 保科正之 (1611-1672), a powerful disciple of Yamazaki Ansai's 山崎闇齋 (1618-82) Neo-Confucian teachings, exiled Sokō from Edo for a decade due to Sokō's publication of his supposedly insufferable treatise, *Seikyō yōroku* 聖教要録 (Essential meanings of sagely Confucianism). The latter called for a return to ancient Confucianism rather than acceptance of the less traditional Neo-Confucian variety. Equally significant, it was written in the politically charged *seimei* 正名 (C: *zhengming*) or "rectification of names" genre, one which viewed the right definition of terms as the most fundamental preliminary measure for those seeking to govern a realm.²

Sokō was exiled to Akō domain, which he had served earlier as a teacher of martial philosophy. All evidence suggests that Sokō's teachings were commissioned and consumed by the Asano family, *daimyō* of Akō, rather than samurai retained by them. Nevertheless, not long after forty-six *rōnin*, former retainers of the late Asano Naganori 淺野長矩 (1667-1701), attacked and murdered, in 1703, the man they blamed for their lord's death two years before, allegations were made, by various parties, that Sokō's teachings were responsible for the illegal and unrighteous vendetta. Scrutiny of such

¹ Wm. Theodore de Bary et al., eds., *Sources of Japanese Tradition* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1958), p. 394; H. Paul Varley, *Japanese Culture* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1973), pp. 184-85; Conrad Schirokauer, *A Brief History of Chinese and Japanese Civilizations* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1989), p. 363.

² *Analects*, 13/3, Hong Ye 洪業 et al., eds., *Lunyu yinde/Mengzi yinde* 論語引得 / 孟子引得 (Concordance to the *Analects* and *Mencius*; hereafter, all references to the *Analects* are to the *Analects Concordance*, and those to the *Mencius* are to the *Mencius Concordance*) (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1988), p. 25. In 13/3, Zilu asks Confucius what he would do first if the ruler of the state of Wei gave him responsibility for governing Wei. Confucius replied that the most "necessary" (*bi* 必) project would be that of *zhengming* 正名 "rectifying the meanings of terms." Most likely, the *Seikyō yōroku* was considered an offensive text because in it Sokō was legislating philosophical meaning as though he had been charged with responsibility for ruling the realm. Though Confucius recognized the importance of defining terms, he did not make that project his primary concern.

allegations, however, reveals not a shred of compelling evidence linking Sokō's ideas to the vendetta.³ Indeed, Sokō's *shidō* sought to "tame" samurai as educated and civil rulers of the political order, rather than encourage them to indulge in vigilante exploits aimed, even if only indirectly, at the *bakufu*.⁴

In the twentieth century, claims linking Sokō and the Akō *rōnin* were given a more positive, and nationalistic, spin by Inoue Tetsujirō 井上哲次郎(1855-1944), one of the most eminent and influential faculty members at Tokyo Imperial University prior to his retirement in 1923. Even as an emeritus Imperial University don, Inoue continued to enjoy enormous prestige as a philosopher-educator until his death, at eighty-eight, in 1944. As a metaphysician Inoue was a leading exponent of the "phenomena are reality" (*genshō sunawachi jitsuzai ron* 現象即実在論) doctrine.⁵ He was most prolific, however, as an historian of Japanese Confucian philosophy and as a theorist of *kokumin dōtoku* 国民道德, or "national morality." Inoue's work in these areas converged decisively in his interpretations of Yamaga Sokō. His studies of Tokugawa philosophical history enabled him to locate in Sokō's thought, and its supposed impact on the *rōnin* vendetta, crucial foundations of what he called Japan's "national morality." As a scholar devoutly loyal to Japan's imperial house, Inoue was not bothered by the fact that the *rōnin* were criminals in their own day, having been forced to commit *seppuku* 切腹 for their felonious vendetta. From philosophical history Inoue proceeded, after 1905, to the work which enveloped his life for the next four decades: defining *kokumin dōtoku* in terms simple enough for digestion by high school students, the educated public, and members of the Imperial armed forces. Although Inoue never viewed himself as a proponent of nationalist, imperialistic, or militarist ideological constructs, it is difficult, from the vantage point of postwar intellectual historiography, not to see his writings in such terms.

³ Hori Isao 堀勇雄, *Yamaga Sokō* 鹿素行, Jinbutsu sōsho, vol. 33 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1959), pp. 267-79. Postwar Japanese scholarship on Sokō and the *rōnin* vendetta rarely mentions the supposed links between them. The leading proponent of such claims is Sasaki Moritarō 佐々木杜太郎, a member of the Sokō kai 素行会 and Chūō gishi kai 中央義士会. In *Yamaga Sokō*, Nihon no shisōka, vol. 8 (Tokyo: Meitoku shuppansha, 1978), pp. 212-26, Sasaki contends that Sokō taught the *rōnin*. Other works by Sasaki include *Gendaijin no Yamaga Sokō shi o zendō ni mamoru bushidō* 現代人の山鹿素行死を全道に守る武士道 (Tokyo: Kubo shoten, 1964) and *Akō gishi shiryō* 赤穂義士史料 (Tokyo: Shinjinbutsu ōraisha, 1983).

⁴ Eiko Ikegami, *The Taming of the Samurai: Honorific Individualism and the Making of Modern Japan* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995), pp. 309-11.

⁵ Inoue explained this doctrine in a famous article, "Genshō sunawachi jitsuzairon no yōryō" 現象即実在論の要領, published in *Tetsugaku zasshi* 哲学雑誌 in 1897. For a brief account of Inoue's metaphysics, see Itō Tomonobu 伊藤友信, "Inoue Tetsujirō," in *Kindai Nihon tetsugaku shisōka jiten* 近代日本哲学思想家辞典 (Tokyo: Tokyo shoseki, 1982), pp. 60-61. Also, Gino Piovesana, *Recent Japanese Philosophical Thought, 1862-1996: A Survey* (Richmond: Japan Library, 1997, revised version of the 1963 Enderle Bookstore edition), pp. 37-43. Piovesana states that *genshō sunawachi jitsuzai* was Inoue's rendering of the German *Identitätsrealismus*. Also see Funayama Shin'ichi 船山信一, *Meiji tetsugaku shi kenkyū* 明治哲学史研究 (Tokyo: Minerva shoin, 1950), pp. 77-126. Inoue explained the epistemological ramifications of his metaphysics in "Ninshiki to jitsuzai to no kankei" 認識と実在との関係, which appeared in *Tetsugaku zasshi* in 1901.

There was relatively little variation in Inoue's thinking on Sokō: he consistently lauded him as the first systematic theorist of *bushidō* 武士道, or “the way of the samurai”; he credited him with being the teacher of the forty-seven Akō *rōnin*; and, finally he identified him as a leading figure in the articulation of Japan's imperialist *kokutai* 国体, or its “distinctive national essence,” consisting of its unbroken line of sacred emperors. Developmental shifts in Inoue's thinking are evident in his move away from philosophical historiography toward dissemination of his interpretations of Sokō in tracts, treatises, textbooks, and anthologies expounding *kokumin dōtoku*, *kokutai*, *bushidō*, and *gunjin dōtoku* 軍人道德, or “military ethics.” Yet more than any developmental schema, this essay highlights the extent to which Inoue's claims about Sokō and the *rōnin* enjoyed, prior to 1945, nearly universal acceptance in various fields, including philosophico-ideological writings, art, drama, and literature. I also wish to emphasize the essentially ideological, rather than objectively historiographical, nature of Inoue's claims about Sokō and the *rōnin*. Finally, I shall point out how an appreciation of Inoue's ideological assertions about Sokō and the *rōnin* makes early postwar writings of intellectual historians such as Maruyama Masao 丸山真男(1914-1996) more intelligible.

Inoue's Early Life and Work

A brief intellectual biography of Inoue is in order since it will shed light on his scholarly interest in Sokō. Inoue was born the son of a physician in Dazaifu 大宰府, Chikuzen 筑前, now part of Fukuoka Prefecture on the island of Kyūshū. In the 1913 edition of his *Nippon kogakuha no tetsugaku* 日本古学派の哲学 (Philosophy of the Japanese School of Ancient Learning), Inoue noted that Sokō's *Kafu* 家譜 (Family genealogy) traced the Yamaga clan to Chikuzen.⁶ Inoue's interest in Sokō was possibly heightened by the fact that he hailed from Sokō's ancestral stomping grounds. After early training in Confucianism by a Dazaifu scholar, Nakamura Tokuzan 中村徳山, Inoue moved to Nagasaki to study English. He later matriculated at Tōkyō kaisei gakkō 東京開成学校 in 1875 and graduated two years later. In 1877 Inoue enrolled as a student of philosophy at the newly established Imperial University in Tokyo. In part, he credited his decision to pursue philosophy to the Confucian education he had received from Nakamura.⁷

At Tokyo University, Inoue studied under Ernest Fenollosa (1853-1908), a Harvard-educated disciple of Herbert Spencer (1820-1903), and the holder of the first chair in philosophy at Tokyo University. Inoue was probably influenced by Fenollosa's

⁶ Inoue Tetsujirō, *Nippon kogakuha no tetsugaku* 日本古学派の哲学 (Tokyo: Fuzanbō, 1921 reprint of the 1915 edition), p. 752. Originally published in 1902, *Nippon kogakuha no tetsugaku* was revised in 1913. The 1921 edition was the ninth printing of volume two of Inoue's popular history of Tokugawa philosophy. In romanizing the title, this paper follows the card catalogue version at Kyoto University which renders the characters 日本 as Nippon, although they are now commonly read as Nihon.

⁷ Inoue Tetsujirō, *Inoue Tetsujirō jiden* 井上哲次郎自伝 (Tokyo: Fuzanbō, 1973), pp. 3-6. Also, Itō Tomonobu, “Inoue Tetsujirō,” in *Kindai Nihon tetsugaku shisōka jiten*, p. 60.

call for the preservation of Japan's cultural heritage.⁸ At any rate, that project surely characterized Inoue's understanding of his own work as a philosopher-educator. In 1880, Inoue was part of his university's first graduating class. After a brief stint with the Monbushō 文部省 (Ministry of Education), he returned to Tokyo University in 1882 as an assistant professor of Asian philosophy. Between 1884 and 1890, he traveled abroad, with Monbushō support, studying in Berlin, Heidelberg, and Leipzig. Returning to Japan in 1890, he was appointed professor of philosophy at his alma mater, renamed Tokyo Imperial University in 1886. Inoue was, incidentally, the first Japanese to hold a chair in philosophy there.⁹

The same year Inoue authored, at the request of the Monbushō, his *Chokugo engi* 勅語衍義 (Commentary on the Imperial Rescript on Education), which was published, also by the Monbushō, in 1891.¹⁰ Carol Gluck has remarked that Inoue was the “premier representative” of a group of academics sometimes referred to as *goyō gakusha* 御用学者, or “scholars in service to the state.” While Gluck describes Inoue as “one of the most prolific ideologues of civil morality in the late Meiji period,” she adds that Inoue saw himself as “an independent scholar who toiled in the service of philosophy and the nation rather than the state.” She adds, however, that academics such as Inoue often “led the ideological charge” in creating a patriotic narrative, with the Monbushō printing the message but rarely initiating it as such. The result, in the *Chokugo engi*, was Inoue's reinterpretation of Confucian virtues as a form of “collective patriotism.”¹¹

Apparently for similar reasons, Irokawa Daikichi 色川大吉 characterizes Inoue as “the scholastic heir of Katō Hiroyuki 加藤弘之 (1836-1916) at Tokyo University,”¹² i.e., as a scholar who defined his academic interests in ways consistent with the ideological needs of the imperial state. Irwin Scheiner and Peter Duus refer to Inoue as a “neo-traditionalist” who, like Hozumi Yatsuka 穂積八束 (1860-1912), blended Confucian

⁸ Piovesana, *Recent Japanese Philosophical Thought*, p. 26. Kenneth B. Pyle, *The New Generation in Meiji Japan: Problems of Cultural Identity, 1885-1895* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1969), p. 85.

⁹ Saitō Junshi 齋藤純枝, “Dentō shisō no kindaiteki saihensei to Doitsu tetsugaku no dōnyū” 伝統思想の近代的再編成とドイツ哲学の導入, in Miyakawa Tōru 宮川透 and Arakawa Ikuo 荒川幾男, eds., *Nihon kindai tetsugaku shi* 日本近代哲学史 (Tokyo: Yūhikaku, 1976), p. 60.

¹⁰ Yamazaki Masakazu and Miyakawa Tōru, “Inoue Tetsujirō: The Man and His Works,” *Philosophical Studies of Japan*, No. 7 (Tokyo: Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, 1966), pp. 121-22. Inoue's *Commentary* was an important document throughout the war years. For example, in 1942, fifty-two years after the *Chokugo engi* was written, Kōbundō shoten published Inoue's *Shakumei Kyōiku chokugo engi* 釈明教育勅語衍義, a work in which Inoue incorporated many of his ideas on *kokumin dōtoku* into his earlier explication of the Imperial Rescript on Education. While justifying Japan's wartime exploits as the “completion of a great undertaking” based on the “way of the gods” (*kami nagara no michi* 神ながらの道), Inoue did not develop themes related to *bushidō* in his *Shakumei*.

¹¹ Carol Gluck, *Japan's Modern Myths: Ideology in the Late Meiji Period* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985), pp. 128-30.

¹² Irokawa Daikichi, “The Emperor System as a Spiritual Structure,” *The Culture of the Meiji Period* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985), p. 291.

morality and nativist myth into a highly nationalistic civil religion.¹³ Kenneth Pyle situates Inoue among intellectuals such as Takayama Chogyū 高山樗牛(1871-1902), Tokutomi Sohō 徳富蘇峰(1863-1957), and others who encouraged youth to make service to the nation of Japan “their religion.” Pyle adds that these intellectuals propagated *Nippon shugi* 日本主義, a conservative, nationalistic ideology justifying the kind of sacrifices required to achieve the nation’s industrial and military goals, especially in the years after the first Sino-Japanese War.¹⁴

This essay concurs with these appraisals of Inoue, but also emphasizes the extent to which he was much more than a late-Meiji scholar. Although the beginnings of his ideological work are evident with his *Commentary on the Imperial Rescript on Education*, Inoue’s writings became increasingly nationalistic, imperialistic, and militaristic in the final decade of the Meiji period, and continued to be so during the so-called “liberal” 1920s. Moreover, even after he had retired from Tokyo University, Inoue, in the 1930s and 1940s, authored or edited a prodigious amount of ideologically-charged literature, much of it amplifying themes adumbrated in his early interpretations of Sokō and the *rōnin*, especially those related to *bushidō* and *kokutai*. Indeed longevity and prolificacy made Inoue, despite his unofficial capacity, the leading ideological theorist operating in the final decade of the nineteenth and the first-half of the twentieth centuries. So much so was this true that many of the claims of postwar thinkers such as Maruyama Masao, which now seem peculiar if not idiosyncratic, can be most fully appreciated when juxtaposed with Inoue’s views on similar topics. If that is done, it becomes apparent that their assertions were attempts at ideological refutation of Inoue rather than disinterested intellectual historiography. Thus, for example, Maruyama’s praise for Ogyū Sorai 荻生徂徠(1666-1728) and his thinking on the Akō *rōnin* become much more sensible, as an erudite and euphemistic denunciation of *kokumin dōtoku*, when considered in relation to Inoue’s elevation of Sokō as the teacher of the *rōnin*.

The Genealogy of Inoue’s Views on Sokō and the *Rōnin*

Inoue’s claim that Yamaga Sokō’s teachings on *bushidō* provided the philosophical inspiration for the Akō *rōnin* vendetta of 1703, amplified earlier claims by Yoshida Shōin 吉田松陰 (1830-1859) regarding the positive, even decisive, impact that Sokō’s *shidō* exerted on the Akō *rōnin*.¹⁵ Via simple reiteration, Inoue conferred on

¹³ Peter Duus and Irwin Scheiner, “Socialism, Liberalism, and Marxism, 1901-1931,” in *The Cambridge History of Japan, Volume 6: The Twentieth Century*, ed. Peter Duus (New York: Cambridge University Press), p. 654-55.

¹⁴ Kenneth Pyle, *The New Generation*, pp. 192-95.

¹⁵ See Tahara Tsuguo 田原嗣郎, *Yamaga Sokō* 山鹿素行, *Nihon no meicho*, vol. 12 (Tokyo: Chūō kōron, 1971), p. 16. Tahara quotes Shōin’s *Bukyō zensho kōroku* 武経全書講録 as remarking: “We samurai...must strive to repay the grace and bounty provided this imperial land by striving always to fulfill the way of the samurai.... If samurai wish to comprehend their way, they must accept the precepts of our first samurai teacher, Yamaga Sokō.... When we have studied what Master Sokō recorded in the *Bukyō zensho*, we understand this completely.... With thorough scrutiny of the Akō vendetta, we understand what Ōishi Kuranosuke 大石内蔵助(1659-1703), the leader of the *rōnin*, learned from teacher Sokō.” Before Shōin, the *Sentetsu sōdan kōhen* 先哲叢談後編 (1829) had also credited, in a complementary way, Sokō with having

Shōin's historically questionable assertions an air of academic respectability, something they had sorely lacked. Moreover, Inoue's endorsement of Shōin's praise for Sokō's supposed impact on the *rōnin* sealed the positive metamorphosis of such claims, at least until Hori Isao's 堀勇雄 biography of Sokō debunked them in the late-1950s.¹⁶ Over a century before Shōin, early-eighteenth-century Confucian scholars had already alleged links between Sokō and the *rōnin* vendetta, but they did so specifically in order to malign Sokō's teachings. Satō Naokata 佐藤直方 (1650-1719), a proponent of Yamazaki Ansai's Kimon 崎門 school of Zhu Xi 朱熹 (1130-1200) Neo-Confucianism, and Dazai Shundai 太宰春台 (1680-1747), an interpreter of Ogyū Sorai's political philosophy, were the most noteworthy proponents of these early allegations. Despite their philosophical differences in the realm of Confucian philosophy, Naokata and Shundai jointly adumbrated the notion that Sokō taught the *rōnin* and was responsible for their unrighteous, felonious vendetta.¹⁷ It seems that these otherwise disparate philosophers found common ground in slandering Sokō's teachings by launching unsubstantiated allegations regarding their pivotal role in instigating the 1703 vendetta.

Because the essays of Naokata and Shundai condemned the vendetta and all associated with it, their allegations linking Sokō and the *rōnin* were meant to damn the Yamaga teachings in the eyes of the Tokugawa *bakufu*. After all, the *bakufu* had already declared the *rōnin* felons. Thus, it was not likely to favor scholars promoting ideas which might inspire further criminal behavior of a similar kind. Since it had earlier exiled Sokō from Edo for publication of his *Seikyō yōroku*, the *bakufu* was more than prepared to believe the worst about Sokō's thinking. Sokō was exiled to Akō domain for almost a decade as punishment for publishing the *Seikyō yōroku*, which is why Naokata and Shundai so readily concluded that Sokō's philosophy had informed the *rōnin* vendetta, despite the fact that the latter occurred nearly three decades after Sokō was pardoned and promptly departed Akō, and two decades after his death.

It is true that Sokō had earlier served the *daimyō* of Akō domain as a teacher of martial philosophy. However during his tenure, Sokō remained in Edo for all but a few months; thus his impact on domainal samurai was at most minimal. Exile to Akō, a *tozama* domain, had dealt a deathblow to Sokō's school as an intellectual force in Edo. Repeated implication in the *rōnin* vendetta contributed to the final atrophy of Sokō's teachings, forcing the ultimate closure of the Yamaga school in Edo in the mid-eighteenth century. It is noteworthy that neither the *rōnin* nor the Yamaga school at the time of the vendetta acknowledged any link between Sokō's thought and the vendetta. Indeed, Sokō's personal dream, and the original purpose of his teachings, was that of service to

transformed the Akō samurai. Thus decades later, the *Sentetsu sōdan kōhen* explained, they were able to take revenge on their deceased lord's enemy.

¹⁶ Hori Isao, *Yamaga Sokō*, pp. 267-79.

¹⁷ Satō Naokata, *Shijūrokunin no hikki* 四十六人之筆記, in *Kinsei buke shisō* 近世武家思想, ed. by Ishii Shirō 石井紫郎, *Nihon shisō taikai*, vol. 27 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1974), p. 379. Naokata's disciples tended to endorse his critical appraisal of the *rōnin*. Another Kimon scholar, Asami Keisai 浅見綱斎 (1652-1711), criticized Naokata on every count, even ridiculing his suggestion that Sokō had impacted the *rōnin*. See Keisai's *Shijūrokushi ron* 四十六人論, *Kinsei buke shisō*, p. 396. Thus, the Kimon school was actually divided over the issue. Dazai Shundai, in his *Akō shijūrokushi ron* 赤穂四十六士論, also condemned Sokō's teachings for inspiring the Akō vendetta. See *Kinsei buke shisō*, pp. 404-08.

the Tokugawa *bakufu*, not inciting samurai revenge attacks which might in the least be construed as subversive to its authority.

By the end of the Tokugawa, the situation was quite different. Partly due to early negative allegations linking Sokō's teachings to the *rōnin* vendetta, the Yamaga school had disappeared from Edo and found service elsewhere, primarily in distant *tozama* domains where ultimate allegiance to the *bakufu* was not always a primary concern. Claims linking Sokō and the *rōnin* thus came to be acknowledged and given a different, positive interpretive spin, via direction at an essentially anti-*bakufu* audience, one composed largely of students from these *tozama* domains. Thereupon those allegations became bragging points for late-Tokugawa advocates of Sokō's ideas such as Yoshida Shōin. Because he had also formulated pro-imperial theses, Sokō was an especially popular thinker among activist *shishi* who subscribed to Shōin's enthusiastic endorsement of the erstwhile allegations condemning Sokō as the source of philosophical inspiration for the Akō *rōnin*.

During the early-Meiji period, Sokō's fortunes rose dramatically, especially in the wake of a proclamation issued in 1868 by the Meiji emperor, and read before the graves of the *rōnin*, expressing imperial admiration for their vendetta. The *rōnin*, criminals of the ancien régime, were apparently to become saints in the new Meiji order. During the late-Meiji period, Sokō's fortunes soared, especially as imperial Japan astounded the world with successive military victories first over Qing-dynasty China and then Tsarist Russia. These victories prompted scholars to explain the roots of Japanese military prowess, and in their attempts Sokō often figured prominently. After Inoue's endorsement of Shōin's views, discussions of Sokō were nearly always accompanied by at least a praiseful allusion to the allegedly crucial impact his *shidō* had had on the *rōnin* vendetta and Japan's *kokutai*.

Inoue offered no substantial documentary evidence, other than a naïve appeal to Yoshida Shōin's writings, for his claims linking Sokō's *shidō* to the vendetta. Nevertheless his repetition of those assertions, coupled with his unparalleled stature as a philosopher-educator, apparently made them seem beyond reproach. The seemingly sacrosanct nature of Inoue's views on Sokō and the *rōnin* were subsequently buttressed by their endorsement by leading military figures such as General Nogī, Admiral Tōgō, and a host of others. Between 1912 and 1945, Inoue's views on Sokō became far more significant than most scholarly theses pertaining to Tokugawa philosophical history. After all, the Sokō-*rōnin* connection served as a crucial nexus around which Inoue merged motifs such as *bushidō*, *kokutai*, and *sonnō* 尊王, or "reverence for the emperor," into an oft-repeated ideological narrative encouraging an ethic of nationalistic, militaristic, and imperialistic self-sacrifice.

Such pugnacious themes became standard in the 1930s and early-1940s as a byproduct of their aggressive promotion by Inoue and others in the Taishō period (1912-1926), an era of cultural history often associated with trends toward liberalism and political democracy. Inoue's thinking about Sokō's impact on the *rōnin* foreshadowed and, to an extent, contributed to the rise of even more ardently militaristic, nationalistic, and imperialistic ideological constructs which came to dominate the culture of wartime Japan between 1931 and 1945. Because Inoue's writings were widely read—some as compulsory texts in high schools¹⁸—his views on Sokō and the *rōnin* provide insights

¹⁸ Wai-ming Ng, "Civil Morality in the Life and Thought of Inoue Tetsujirō (1855-1944)," *British Columbia Asian Review* 9 (Winter 1995-96), pp. 215, 217.

into patterns of thought informing behavior in the 1930s and early 1940s. Inoue's interpretations of Sokō also reveal how readily intellectual history can be warped and philosophical traditions fabricated for the sake of ethico-ideological justification of a profoundly mistaken national course of action.

Lastly, they provide a useful foil for understanding and appraising the writings of Inoue's successor in the field of intellectual history, the late Maruyama Masao. Though his intellectual historiography is widely recognized as the product of an interpretive genius, Maruyama's early thinking on Tokugawa thought has also been criticized for its blatant disregard for facts. Defenders typically note that Maruyama's early claims were more meant as thinly veiled critiques of the "anti-modern," pro-imperialistic ideological currents dominating the intellectual scene in the early 1940s. Those sympathetic to Maruyama's interpretations are often satisfied with such a general explanation of his early claims, especially his elevation of Ogyū Sorai. This essay offers a more specific explanation of Maruyama's views by suggesting that they be seen as attempts not at writing a "scientific" intellectual historiography of Tokugawa Japan, but at ideologically turning Inoue's elevation of Sokō and the *rōnin* on its head via assigning pivotal significance to one of the unkindest critics of the *rōnin* and the least Japanocentric and most Sinophilic of the Tokugawa scholars: Ogyū Sorai. Maruyama's praise for Sorai expressed, in a kind of erudite code, his diametrical opposition to Inoue's views and those deriving from them.

Inoue's Writings on Sokō and the *Rōnin*

Nippon kogakuha no tetsugaku (1902)

Inoue's positive appraisal of Sokō and the *rōnin*,¹⁹ as well as the beginnings of his distinctive understanding of *kokumin dōtoku*, first appeared in 1902 in his *Nippon kogakuha no tetsugaku*, the second part of his trilogy on the history of Japanese Confucian philosophy. There Inoue praised Sokō as the first Japanese theorist to expound systematically the philosophy of *bushidō* and cited the Akō *rōnin* as early exemplars of Sokō's teachings.²⁰ Inoue thus challenged a central thesis of Nitobe Inazō's 新渡戸稲造(1862-1933) internationally popular work, *Bushidō*. The latter, written in English while Nitobe was convalescing in the United States, was first published in 1899, in Philadelphia; only in the following year did it appear in Japanese. Nitobe's *Bushidō* highlighted, in a general way, Japan's samurai mores as the ethical basis of its impressively rapid modernization during the Meiji period. Nitobe did not privilege any particular scholar, nor any texts, as essential to the ethic he called *bushidō*. Nitobe wrote *Bushidō* not to promote a supposedly systematic, traditional samurai ethic at home, but rather to encourage world peace by facilitating better understandings of Japan abroad.²¹

¹⁹ While this essay always refers to the Akō *rōnin* as *rōnin*, Inoue and others who followed him typically referred to them as *gishi* 義士, or "righteous samurai." The accolade, *gishi*, was an abbreviation of *chūshin gishi* 忠臣義士, or "loyal and righteous samurai." The latter term had distinct religious connotations in Neo-Confucian discourse: those who were true *chūshin gishi* could be legitimately worshiped in shrines established for them.

²⁰ Inoue, *Nippon kogakuha no tetsugaku*, pp. 25-26.

²¹ For a recent study of Nitobe, see John F. Howes, *Nitobe Inazō: Japan's Bridge Across the Pacific* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1995). For an overview of *bushidō* and Nitobe's role in early-twentieth century discussions of it, see Martin C. Collcutt, "Bushidō," *Kodansha Encyclopedia*

According to Inoue, Nitobe's claims had belittled *bushidō* by characterizing it as an ethic without any constitutional basis. Specifically, Inoue noted that writings by Sokō such as the *Bukyō shōgaku* 武経小学 (Elementary learning for samurai) and *Yamaga gorui* 山鹿語類 (Classified conversations of Master Yamaga), systematically expressed what Inoue called *bushidō no kenpō* 武士道の憲法, or "the constitution of *bushidō*." Differing again with Nitobe who admitted similarities between *bushidō* and Western chivalry, Inoue judged that foreigners had produced nothing comparable to Sokō's writings. He further declared that the essential spirit of *bushidō* might serve well as the foundation of Japan's ethical code for the future.²² Also implied in Inoue's claims was that Japan's impressively swift modernization, capped by recent military victories, grew out of essentially the same philosophical foundations—Sokō's *bushidō*—that had produced the astoundingly successful vendetta of the Akō *rōnin*.

Inoue also linked *bushidō* and Sokō to the notion of *kokutai* by praising Sokō's supposed advocacy of it, despite the fact that Sokō never addressed the topic as such. As evidence of Sokō's respect for *kokutai*, Inoue cited a passage from Shōin's *Bukyō zensho kōroku* 武経全書講録 (Lectures on Yamaga Sokō's complete works on samurai philosophy), adding that Yoshida Shōin's remarks were "an accurate explication of Sokō's true ideas on *kokutai*." Shōin's *Bukyō zensho kōroku* observed:

Yamaga Sokō was born into an age overpopulated with vulgar Confucians who respected foreign nations such as China while despising their own country. Sokō alone did otherwise, rejecting the heterodox claims of the vulgar scholars of his day. Sokō instead exhaustively studied the way of the ancient gods and sages, and thus edited his *Chūchō jijitsu* 中朝事実 (The true central empire). Sokō's teachings on *kokutai* 国体 can be understood via reflection on the deep ideas of his *Chūchō jijitsu*.

Kokutai refers to the fact that there is an essence (*tai* 躰) of the Divine Land (*shinshū* 神州) of Japan when considered in-itself as the Divine Land, and an essence of foreign countries as they are in-themselves. When scholars praise foreign nations but criticize their own it is because they read foreign books and then consider Japan in light of them. This flaw results from not understanding that the Divine Land has its *kokutai*, while foreign countries have a different *kokutai*.

Inoue added that Meiji scholars were subject to the same faults which had plagued their Tokugawa predecessors: They too found foreign modes of thought more appealing than native ones. This chronic problem, Inoue suggested, made it all the more clear that Sokō, as an advocate of *Nippon shugi*, or "Japanese nationalism," was a truly exceptional philosopher.²³ By casting Sokō as a nationalistic thinker who was among the first to articulate what he, Inoue, understood as Japan's *kokutai* and its national ethic, *bushidō*, Inoue not only offered a critique of Nitobe's intellectual cosmopolitanism; he also began

of Japan, vol. 1 (Tokyo: Kodansha, 1981), p. 223. Also see G. Cameron Hurst, III, "Death, Honor, and Loyalty: The *Bushidō* Ideal," *Philosophy East and West* 40.4 (October 1990), pp. 511-27. Also, Inazō Nitobe, "Bushidō—The Moral Ideas of Japan," in *Japan by the Japanese: A Survey by Its Highest Authorities*, ed. Alfred Stead, (London: William Heinemann, 1904), pp. 262-81.

²² Inoue, *Nippon kogakuha no tetsugaku*, pp. 124-28.

²³ Inoue, *Nippon kogakuha no tetsugaku*, pp. 123-24.

to forge an ideological construct supposedly based in Japan's cultural tradition and conspicuously centered around Sokō.

It is probably no exaggeration to say that Inoue admired Sokō far more than any other Tokugawa philosopher. In contrasting Sokō with the other leading philosophers of the Ancient Learning School, Itō Jinsai 伊藤仁斎(1627-1705) and Ogyū Sorai, Inoue lauded Sokō as the most distinctively Japanese. Inoue praised Jinsai for formulating an activist, organic metaphysics, one which characterized the Ancient Learning movement as a whole in its opposition to the supposed metaphysical quietism of Song philosophy. Inoue also recognized Jinsai for the distinctively ethical emphasis of his Confucian teachings which he referred to alternatively as *dōtoku shugi* 道德主義, “ethical principles,” or *shitoku* 私徳, “private ethics.”²⁴ This contrasted with the principles of Sokō's thought which, according to Inoue, combined *Nippon shugi*, an emphasis on the Japanese nation, with *bushidō*.

Differing from both Sokō and Jinsai was Sorai's brand of Ancient Learning emphasizing *kōtoku* 公德, or “public-political virtues,” as well as the utilitarian (*kōri shugi* 功利主義) concerns of authoritarian, Hobbesian-like statecraft. While Inoue appears to have respected those aspects of Sorai's thought, he criticized Sorai for blatant “China worship” and for literary practices disrespectful to imperial Japan, such as referring to himself, and implicitly his country, as “barbarian,” and to the *bakufu* via epithets typically reserved for the Japanese imperial government alone. Such characteristics of Sorai's learning made it far inferior, Inoue implied, to Sokō's Japanocentrism.²⁵ Ultimately, Inoue saw Jinsai and Sorai as a complementary pair, each needing the other to compensate for their respective deficiencies. Though they followed Sokō and were more erudite in Chinese learning than him, Inoue suggested that neither Jinsai nor Sorai surpassed their predecessor in contributing to the exposition of Japan's indigenous culture. Indeed, the impression Inoue offered his readers was that Ancient Learning, in many respects, reached its apogee with Sokō's emphasis on the Japanese nation, imperial loyalism, and a version of *bushidō* capable of inculcating an ethic of heroic and efficacious self-sacrifice for one's ruler.

***Kokumin dōtoku gairon* (1912)**

Inoue's presentation of Sokō as the premier philosopher of Tokugawa Japan, and perhaps all history, continued in his *Kokumin dōtoku gairon* 国民道德概論 (Outline of Japan's national ethics, 1912), and the 1913 edition of *Nihon kogakuha no tetsugaku*. In

²⁴ Inoue, *Nippon kogakuha no tetsugaku*, pp. 291-307.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 624-42. Inoue Tetsujirō, “Introduction,” *Nippon rinri ihen*, vol. 4 (Tokyo: Ikusei kai, 1931 reprint), pp. 7-8. A similar interpretation appears in the brief biographical account of Sokō included in Inoue's *Bushidō sōsho* 武士道叢書 (Tokyo: Hakubunkan, 1905), pp. 72-73. In that account Inoue states that the courage demonstrated by Ōishi Yoshio and the forty-six samurai of Akō domain in taking revenge on their master's enemy and committing suicide afterwards was the result of their having received Yamaga Sokō's spiritual training in *bushidō* for a period of nineteen years. Also in Inoue's essay, “Japanese Religious Beliefs: Confucianism,” in *Fifty Years of New Japan*, vol. II, comp. Okuma Shigenobu (London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 1909), pp. 57-58, Inoue again states that the forty-seven *rōnin* vendetta was “the outcome of his [Sokō's] influence.” Also Inoue judged that Sokō had “rendered greater service to his country as an advocate of *Bushidō* than as a moral philosopher.”

many ways Inoue's celebration of Sokō and *bushidō* reflected the recent pride Japanese felt due to the international prestige their nation achieved via military victory. By the end of the Meiji period, Imperial Japan was internationally recognized as the most potent military force in Asia. Its defeat of Tsarist Russia in the Russo-Japanese War (1904-05) was, after all, its second major victory in a decade. Along with its earlier defeat of Qing China in 1895, which Inoue compared to Rome's conquest of Greece,²⁶ the defeat of Russia suggested to foreigners and Japanese alike that military success was the most effective means by which Imperial Japan could gain quick international recognition. Inoue's writings, viewed in that context, outlined ethical prescriptions for greater strength and power at home, and prestige abroad.

In *Kokumin dōtoku gairon*, Inoue purportedly analyzed *bushidō* historically and philosophically. Denying that it was a historical relic, Inoue asserted that *bushidō* was an organic ethic, capable of appearing in different forms in various ages. He claimed that *bushidō* had existed in Japan before Buddhism was introduced, but was transformed after the latter appeared. Following the Genpei Wars (1180-85), and with the founding of the Kamakura shogunate, *bushidō* changed again, reflecting the prevalent martial demands of the day. During the next phase, that of Tokugawa Japan, Sokō led the way in redefining *bushidō*, stressing education and learning. Yet Sokō's formulation of *bushidō* was not void of martial emphases, Inoue added, noting how Sokō's ideas first impacted the Akō *rōnin*, then Yoshida Shōin, and ultimately those resolute samurai who led the Meiji Restoration. Inoue asserted that the *seishin* 精神, or "essential spirit," of *bushidō* would continue as a vital ethical force even after the Meiji period because, he claimed, it was not necessarily dependent on the feudal system of pre-Meiji times. Rather, *bushidō* could and should spread throughout society because its spirit was reflected in imperial edicts, while its essence and content consisted of *chūkun aikoku* 忠君愛國, or loyalty and patriotism. In most general terms, Inoue asserted that *bushidō* was a particular form of *kokutai shugi* 国体主義, or those principles underlying Japan's unique national essence.²⁷

Inoue's *Kokumin dōtoku gairon* highlighted Sokō's role in the Tokugawa transformation of *bushidō* into a civil, and not just warrior, ethic. As an educator with no real military background, Inoue most likely appreciated Sokō's efforts at making the samurai teaching something more than a matter of strategy and training. At the same time, Inoue acknowledged Sokō's impact on the Akō *rōnin*, and fully accepted Yoshida Shōin's understanding of Sokō's *shidō* wherein the calculated and ultimately self-sacrificing deeds of the *rōnin* were deemed paradigms for future conduct. Like Shōin, Inoue saw no value, however, in parochial, "feudalistic" displays of loyalty such as the *rōnin* had made on behalf of their *daimyō*. Inoue surely hoped to redirect the kind of ultimate loyalism manifested by the *rōnin* away from feudal lords and toward the imperial throne. Thus, in addition to Sokō's impact on the *ronin*, Inoue recognized Sokō's influence on Shōin and the late-Tokugawa *shishi* who helped bring down the Tokugawa *bakufu* and restore the imperial system as led by the Meiji emperor. By recognizing Sokō as the constitutional theorist of *bushidō*, and *bushidō* as a form of *kokutai shugi*, Inoue identified Sokō's thought as one significant articulation of the

²⁶ Marius B. Jansen, "Changing Japanese Attitudes Towards Modernization," in *Changing Japanese Attitudes Towards Modernization*, ed. Marius Jansen (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965), p. 76.

²⁷ Inoue Tetsujirō, *Kokumin dōtoku gairon* (Tokyo: Sanshodō, 1930, 7th edition), pp. 142-72.

national morality of Japan. As Inoue's writings went through more editions, and as they came to play "a leading role in formulating...state morality appropriate for school instruction,"²⁸ ideologues who were even more ultrarightist in outlook reasserted similar links, often amplifying them in increasingly nationalistic, imperialistic, and militaristic contexts.

On Yamaga Sokō and General Nogi

Following the suicides of General Nogi Maresuke 乃木希典(1849-1912) and his wife shortly after the death of the Meiji emperor, Inoue amplified his glorification of Sokō and *bushidō* by proclaiming the late general the most recent exemplar of Sokō's martial teachings. Earlier manifestations of those teachings could be found, Inoue claimed, in the leader of the Akō *rōnin*, Ōishi Yoshio 大石良雄(1659-1703), and in Yoshida Shōin, the Chōshū scholar of Sokō's thought who taught many of the leaders of the Meiji Restoration.

Inoue claimed that General Nogi's final thoughts could be fathomed by reading Sokō's *Chūchō jijitsu*, which Nogi had presented to the Crown Prince just three days before his suicide. That work, he explained, detailed the essentials of *kokutai*. It differed from virtually all Tokugawa Confucian literature insofar as it identified Japan as "the true Central Empire." Most of Sokō's Confucian contemporaries referred to China as Chūgoku 中国 (the Central Kingdom) or as Chūka 中華 (the Central Blossom), and to their own country in less complementary terms. But Sokō differed, asserting that Japan's *kokutai* had existed since the age of the gods when august deities, progenitors of the imperial family, had created Japan, not China, as the true Central Empire. Furthermore, Sokō added, the sacrosanct nature of Japan was evident in the fact that its imperial line had reigned unbroken over millenia, unlike the Chinese imperial system which had witnessed repeated dynastic overthrows. Utter loyalty to the Japanese emperor, as opposed to the self-centered tendency to treachery evident throughout Chinese history, differentiated Japanese from Chinese, as well as all other peoples. Presumably, Inoue meant to suggest that General Nogi's suicide, following the Meiji emperor in death, exemplified the self-sacrificing imperial loyalism which Sokō's *Chūchō jijitsu* supposedly extolled as the characteristic feature of Japanese.

Inoue declared that the *Chūchō jijitsu* was the most mature and magnificent work of Sokō's corpus. Because *kokutai* was relevant to Japanese jurisprudence, political science, and sociology, and many other new branches of learning, Inoue claimed that Sokō's *Chūchō jijitsu* remained an excellent and extremely relevant work, even by contemporary standards. For similar reasons Nogi had Sokō's *Bukyō shōgaku* and *Bukyō honron* 武経本論(Fundamentals of samurai philosophy) published, along with Shōin's *Bukyō shōgaku kōroku*—a set of lectures on Sokō's *Bukyō shōgaku*—as three of the most

²⁸ Irokawa, "The Heights and Depths of Popular Consciousness," *The Culture of the Meiji Period*, p. 190. It is noteworthy that in 1912, the year *Kokumin dōtoku gairon* was published, Basil Hall Chamberlain, emeritus professor of Japanese and philology at Tokyo Imperial University, published a pamphlet, *The Invention of a New Religion* (London: Watts & Co., 1912), criticizing "mikado-worship and Japan worship" along with "*Bushido*." Chamberlain added that a decade or two before, "*Bushido* was unknown." It seems that the "new religion" against which Chamberlain wrote was in part the *kokumin dōtoku* promoted by Inoue and others. See below.

important texts for studies of *bushidō*.²⁹ Inoue further observed that while General Nogi's true research interests were in Sokō and Shōin, his most passionate interest was Japan, and to the end his real focus was “Nippon chūshin shugi”日本中心主義, or “Japan-centrism,” and “Teishitsu chūshin shugi”帝室中心主義, or “imperialism.” Though he admired the West, Nogi's purpose, according to Inoue, was always Japan, and most specifically, its imperial throne.³⁰ Implied in Inoue's assessment of Nogi was that these orientations in his learning were shaped by his study of Sokō's works, even though in the end Nogi went beyond mere reverence for Sokō and towards respect for the objects of veneration evident in Sokō's learning: Japan and its imperial family.

Turning to Nogi's death, Inoue related that the General had confided to him, and others, how he was troubled about dying vainly. Nogi believed that while he should preserve his life, at the same time he had to be ready to sacrifice it at the right moment for his emperor and nation. The same way of thinking characterized the thought of Sokō and Shōin. Many courageous followers of Sokō had laid down their lives in history; most recently, there was General Nogi. Inoue thus suggested that when the Yamaga teachings were considered from this angle, one realized their ultimate concern. Inoue added that in the education of Japanese youth, there was something egregiously missing. The teachings of Sokō, Shōin, and Nogi, he affirmed, could fill that void with powerful spiritual value.³¹

More cautiously, Inoue admitted that suicides often resulted from failure or loss of hope. He allowed that most suicides were tragic and unnecessary. But that was not the case when a brave man or a courageous samurai carefully planned his own self-sacrifice. On the contrary, Inoue declared, such a suicide produced exquisitely beautiful consequences. Undoubtedly, Inoue confided, if Nogi were alive he would be making significant contributions to society. Nogi apparently understood, however, that *junshi*殉死, or “following his lord, the emperor, in death,” would move heaven and earth and powerfully influence society. Inoue thus affirmed that when the magnitude of Nogi's death was considered, one could not judge it wrong. While Inoue conceded that neither suicide nor *junshi* were universally good, still in Nogi's case, such a death constituted an outstanding conclusion to life. From the perspective of Nogi's way of thinking, his suicide was a cause for celebration, despite the fact that, from the vantage point of society, it meant the loss of a great man and sadness to many. Inoue added how Nogi's *junshi* demonstrated the power of *bushidō* and speculated that the suicide would exert an extraordinary impact on Japan.³²

²⁹ Inoue, *Nippon kogakuha no tetsugaku*, pp. 809-11. Inoue's essay, “Our Teacher Yamaga Sokō and General Nogi,” was first delivered on September 26, 1912, during the annual ceremony commemorating Sokō's demise, at the Sōsanji 宗参寺 Temple where his remains were interred.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 822.

³¹ Inoue, *Nippon kogakuha no tetsugaku*, pp. 826-27.

³² *Ibid.*, pp. 827-29. Also see Inoue's *Jinkaku to shūyō* 人格と修養 (Tokyo: Kōbundō, 1941), pp. 256-72, for a similar account of Inoue's personal acquaintance with General Nogi, the General's involvement in the Sokō kai, Nogi's thought and its connections with that of Sokō and Shōin, Nogi's writings and publications, Nogi's relationship to religion and ethics, Nogi's links to the arts, and Nogi's death. Inoue's “Preface” explains that the material included in *Jinkaku to shūyō* he wrote in 1915, for use in teaching young people. The published text, illustrated with pictures of General Nogi, Jesus, the Buddha, Confucius, Socrates, Darwin, Kant, and Kaibara Ekken, and accompanied by *furigana* throughout, was meant for popular consumption. Also, Inoue,

There can be no doubt that Inoue meant to suggest that Sokō's teachings had played a role in General Nogi's life and death much as they had in that of the Akō *rōnin*. After all, as Inoue explained, that he knew General Nogi at all resulted from the late general's early admiration for his, Professor Inoue's, writings on Sokō, *bushidō*, and the *rōnin*. As a result of the latter, Nogi and others were inspired to found the Sokō Society (Sokō kai 素行会), a group devoted to holding annual commemorative ceremonies for Sokō out of respect for his contributions to the articulation of *bushidō* and *kokutai*. General Nogi had also been one of the prime forces behind the conferral of posthumous imperial rank and title on Yamaga Sokō. Moreover, it was Nogi who reverently announced those posthumous honors before Sokō's grave. It was because of Inoue's exaltation of Sokō that Nogi had come to know the Professor, and because of their bond in respect for Sokō that Inoue had been asked to deliver a eulogy for the late general. Though never declared as such, implicit in the choice of Inoue to deliver the eulogy was the recognition that Sokō's *bushidō* had once again inspired an unparalleled display of self-sacrificing imperial loyalism of the sort that all Japanese ought to be encouraged to emulate.

Inoue's Later Writings

Due to the interpretations of Sokō promoted by Inoue, Sokō gained considerable fame as a Confucian philosopher in pre-1945 literature. Ironically, Inoue was so successful in promoting the vigilante-loyalist model of *rōnin* behavior as *kokumin dōtoku* that in 1926, at age 71, he fell victim to fanatic nationalists who attacked his *Waga kokutai to kokumin dōtoku* 我が国体と国民道徳 (Our national essence and national ethics, 1925), for profaning the three imperial treasures. In this work, a monograph approved by the Monbushō, Inoue observed, much to the displeasure of ultrarightist critics, that the authenticity of the three treasures was "perhaps not indisputable."³³ In 1926, following sharp criticism of *Waga kokutai*, Inoue resigned his seat in the House of Peers, which he had held only a year; and the presidency of Daitō bunka gakuin 大東文化学院, a post he had taken after retirement from Tokyo Imperial University.³⁴

Despite such attacks, Inoue's dedication to imperial nationalism did not waiver: in 1931, he published a revised edition of his 1912 study of *kokumin dōtoku*, entitled *Shinshū kokumin dōtoku gairon* 新修国民道徳概論 (Outline of Japan's national ethics, revised). In 1934, he published *Nippon seishin no honshitsu* 日本精神の本質 (Fundamentals of the Japanese spirit), a discussion of Shintō and the religious culture of Japan. Between 1934 and 1941, he edited the two-volume *Bushidō shū* 武士道集 (Bushidō anthology). In 1939, two years after Japan's imperial forces invaded China, he finished a popular work, *Tōyō bunka to Shina no shōrai* 東洋文化と支那の将来 (Asian culture and China's future), arguing that Japan was the leading force in the creation of a

"Yamaga Sokō," *Nippon jinmei daijiten* 日本人名大辞典 (Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1979 reprint of the 1938 edition), vol. 6, pp. 314-15. In the *Inoue Tetsujirō jiden*, pp. 46-47, Inoue also remembered the importance of his scholarship for the formation of the Sokō kai, and Sokō's receipt of imperial rank. In this context he also recalled his friendship with General Nogi.

³³ Post Wheeler, *Dragon in the Dust* (New York: Marcel Rodd Co., 1946), p. 221.

³⁴ Inoue, ed., *Inoue Tetsujirō jiden*, p. 79. Yamazaki and Miyakawa, "Inoue Tetsujirō," p. 125. Also, Piovesana, *Recent Japanese Philosophical Thought*, p. 38; Itō, "Inoue Tetsujirō," in *Tetsugaku shisōka jiten*, p. 60.

new Asian culture. Inoue's *Senjinkun* 戦陣訓(Instructions for warfare), published in 1941—with bold calligraphy by then Minister of War Tōjō Hideki 東条英機(1884-1948) stating, “Extend the Imperial Way throughout the world” (*kōdō wa sekai ni hodokoshi* 皇道施世界)—was one of Inoue's more overtly militaristic writings. After examining the history of *bushidō* in Japan, and again noting Sokō's impact on the *rōnin* and their unparalleled role in making society aware of the power of *bushidō*,³⁵ Inoue explained how *bushidō* was intrinsically related to *kōdō* 皇道, or “the imperial way,” as well as *kokutai*. Inoue also attacked liberalism, individualism, socialism, and utilitarianism, while justifying *jibaku* 自爆, or self-destruction, as a military technique distinctive to Japanese troops.³⁶

In 1942, Inoue published *Bushidō no honshitsu* 武士道の本質(Fundamentals of *bushidō*), further evidencing, at least as a civilian, his authoritative role in defining a martial ethic for imperial Japan. In his last two years, Inoue oversaw the compilation of the thirteen-volume *Bushidō zensho* 武経全書(Complete works of *bushidō*). In these works his distinctive interpretations of Sokō, the Akō *rōnin*, *kokutai*, and *bushidō* echoed time and again. Though in postwar academia Sokō's thought has received considerably less attention than either that of Sorai or Jinsai, in prewar scholarship Sokō was far more the focal point, especially in ideologically infused, “scholarly” studies of Tokugawa thought, apparently due to the decidedly militaristic, nationalistic, and imperialistic interpretations of his thought emphasized by Inoue, first in philosophical historiography, then in writings on *kokumin dōtoku*, and finally in his work on *bushidō* and military ethics.

Inoue's Legacy in Ideological Literature

Pre-1945 scholarly and popular writings which reflected Inoue's views are too numerous to list here. A survey of important works impacted by Inoue's writings reveals that they helped catalyze various genres of jingoistic literature wherein Sokō and the *rōnin* figured as exemplars of what was variously called *kokumin dōtoku* or *kokutai*. The latter, and variants such as *gunjin dōtoku* 軍人道德, or “military ethics,” typically extolled teachings inculcating a willingness to make the ultimate sacrifice, as the *rōnin* had, but for the sake of imperial Japan, not a local *daimyō*.

One early example, *Kokumin dōtoku sōsho* 国民道德叢書 (Anthology of national ethics, 1911), paraphrased Inoue's estimation of Sokō's impact on the *rōnin*, noting how Sokō's teachings on service and fidelity were the wellsprings from which their vendetta sprang. *Kokumin dōtoku sōsho* was coedited by Arima Sukemasa 有馬祐政(1873-1931), a Tokyo University graduate who authored several books on Japanese ethics, the imperial way, and emperor worship. Not surprisingly, compilation and publication of *Kokumin*

³⁵ Inoue Tetsujirō, *Senjinkun* 戦陣訓 (Tokyo: Kōbundō shoten, 1941), p. 18. Inoue's “Preface” explains that he authored the “Introduction” and “Conclusion” to the work. The remainder was written by Nakayama Kyūshirō 中山九四郎. Nevertheless, Inoue is billed as its author no doubt due to his prestige as a scholar-ideologue.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 24-28. Also see, Inoue Tetsujirō, “Introduction,” in Saeki Ariyoshi 佐伯有義, *Bushidō hōten* 武士道宝典(Tokyo: Jitsugyō no Nippon sha, 1939), pp. 1-10.

dōtoku sōsho was supervised by Professor Inoue.³⁷ In his history of the development of ethical thought in Japan, Iwahashi Junsei 岩橋遵成(1881-1946) also endorsed Inoue's views regarding Sokō's impact on the *rōnin* and General Nogi. Iwahashi referred to this connection as a matter of common knowledge.³⁸ Iwahashi's assessment, made in 1915, of what were clearly Inoue's interpretations, suggests the extent to which the latter had already come to be accepted as "truth."

The literary historian Mozumi Takami 物集高見(1847-1928) similarly opened the twelfth volume of the *Kōgaku sōsho* 皇学叢書(Anthology of treatises on the imperial throne, 1931) with a modern edition of Sokō's *Chūchō jijitsu*. Introducing that work, Mozumi noted that Inoue had characterized Sokō as the ancestral teacher of *bushidō*, and as an incarnation of its precepts. Mozumi also quoted Inoue's comparisons of Sokō to Jinsai and Sorai. While admitting that the latter were great Ancient Learning scholars, Inoue insisted that they did not match Sokō's contributions to military thought. Inoue thus praised Sokō declaring that before his birth and since his demise, there had never been another like him.

To such praise Mozumi added that Sokō's impact on the *rōnin* exemplified the nature of Sokō's influence on society at large. Mozumi thus observed that contemporary Tokugawa scholars such as Satō Naokata had been right in charging that Sokō had influenced the *rōnin*.³⁹ Ironic here is that while Naokata meant to criticize Sokō via allegations linking Sokō to the vendetta, Mozumi cited them as proof of Sokō's admirable impact. More importantly, Mozumi's judgment that Sokō's influence on the *rōnin* mirrored his impact on Japanese society made explicit the ethical agenda informing first Inoue's and later Mozumi's propagation of *bushidō* as *kokumin dōtoku*: the latter was meant to galvanize the minds and hearts of Japanese for the kind of sacrifice that the *rōnin* had made for their master. In order to ground such ethical preparation in something other than reasons of state, Mozumi followed Inoue in invoking what now seems to have been a fabricated, ideologically-charged national tradition, one featuring Sokō, the *rōnin*, Shōin, and Nogi.

Mozumi also recognized, like Inoue, the *sonnō* activist Yoshida Shōin as a true teacher of Sokō's learning, one who deeply worshiped Sokō as a man and as a thinker. Mozumi added that many of the loyalist *shishi* from Chōshū domain who helped to make the Meiji Restoration had been influenced by Shōin's lectures on Sokō's *shidō* philosophy. Likewise, in the late Meiji, General Nogi both studied Sokō's thought and revered him as a teacher of imperial loyalism and *bushidō*. This was evident, Mozumi

³⁷ Arima Sukemasa 有馬祐政 and Kurokawa Masamichi 黒川政道, eds., *Kokumin dōtoku sōsho*, vol. 1 (Tokyo: Hakubunkan, 1914 reprint of 1911 edition), pp. 2-4. Also see Arima Sukemasa, *Nippon tetsugaku yōron* 日本哲学要論 (Tokyo: Kōyūkan, 1902), p. 231, for another statement of the same line regarding Sokō and the Akō *rōnin*. Although this book featured a preface authored by Inoue, Arima differed with Inoue in citing the *Sentetsu sōdan* 先哲叢談 account of Sokō's impact on the Akō samurai. Inoue criticized that account because it did not emphasize Sokō's years in exile in Akō as the period when he influenced the Akō samurai.

³⁸ Iwahashi Junsei 岩橋遵成, *Dai Nippon rinri shisō hattatsu shi* 大日本倫理思想發達史 (Tokyo: Meguro shoten, 1915), p. 571.

³⁹ Mozumi Takami, ed., *Kōgaku sōsho* (Tokyo: Kōbunko kankōkai, 1931), vol. 12, pp. 15-16. Also see, Nōtomi Yoshitake 納富誠武, *Yamaga Sokō no kokutai kan* 山鹿素行の国体観 (Tokyo: Kakushobō, 1943), p. 2.

observed, from the fact that Nogi presented a copy of the *Chūchō jijitsu*, which he had had published, to the Crown Prince, the future Taishō emperor, just three days before committing suicide to follow the Meiji emperor in death. Years earlier, in 1907, Nogi had also read a formal statement before Sokō's grave announcing Sokō's posthumous elevation to the fourth imperial rank, junior level.⁴⁰ By recounting these anecdotes, Mozumi seemed to hint that Japanese should not only strive to embody Sokō's *bushidō* teachings, but they should also worshipfully respect Sokō as the ancestral formulator of that creed, just as Shōin and Nogi had.

Mozumi was not the only scholar fascinated by the lineage that Inoue had defined for Sokō's teachings, one linking the Akō *rōnin*, Shōin, and most recently Nogi. Others seemed attracted to Sokō and the *ronin* ethic due to the Nogi connection, and thus sought to continue his work, as it had been described by Inoue. For example, in addition to works by Sokō published by Nogi and the Sokō Society, some of Sokō's writings, especially those related to military history or samurai philosophy, were published by organizations such as the Society for Imperial Military Education (Teikoku gunjin kyōikukai 帝国軍人教育会). In 1913, that Society published Sokō's *Bushō genkō roku* 武将言行録 (Biographies of shōguns and samurai). In the latter text was a reminder that the late General Nogi—a full-page portrait of whom graces the opening pages—had revered Sokō. The foreword to the text relates that Sokō's *Bushō genkō roku* was a vital blossom of the seventy million Japanese populating the imperial nation and an expression of their heart and soul. Its "Preface" described Sokō as a philosopher who in criticizing the *bakufu*, admonished it that those governing the nation should not indulge in selfishness. The "Preface" also recalled that Sokō had advocated reverence for the emperor even in an age of feudal domination. Though the *bakufu* deemed him a criminal, the "Preface" asked rhetorically what crime had Sokō really committed?⁴¹

The editor of *Bushō genkō roku*, Yotsumoto Naiji 四元内治, also edited the 1915 edition of the *Yamaga Sokō zenshū* 山鹿素行全集 (Complete works of Yamaga Sokō), published by the Society for the Education of Imperial Japan (Teikoku kyōiku gakkai 帝国教育学会). Yotsumoto's other works included *Aa Nogi taishō* 嗚呼乃木大将 (Alas! General Nogi) and *Meiji tennō shi* 明治天皇史 (A history of the Meiji emperor). Another indication of the surge in Sokō's popularity, especially among those who esteemed military values, was the publication of the *Yamaga heigaku zenshū* 山鹿兵学全集 (Complete works of Yamaga Sokō on military philosophy) in 1917. Cumulatively, these Sokō-related publications suggest the extent to which, long before the 1930s, a militaristic national ethic of self-sacrifice for emperor and imperial nation was crystallizing largely as a byproduct of Inoue's "scholarship" regarding Sokō. While Inoue's training was in philosophy and the modern terminology he used was associated with philosophical discourse—especially words like *tetsugaku*, *dōtoku*, and the like—Inoue's writings, and those influenced by them, appear far more ideological than philosophical.

The 1920s are often described as the apogee of liberalism and democracy in prewar Japan. No doubt there is compelling evidence for this thesis: The 1925 Universal Manhood Suffrage Law, the increasing role of political parties in national government,

⁴⁰ Mozumi Takami, ed., *Kōgaku sōsho*, vol. 12, p. 17.

⁴¹ "Foreword," *Bushō genkō roku* (Tokyo: Kokubunsha, 1913), p. 8.

and the cooperative strategy Japan followed internationally all support this view. But it is also evident that literature of the 1920s prepared the minds of many for the chronic warfare of the next decade, beginning with the Mukden Incident in 1931 and the subsequent occupation of Manchuria by the Kwantung Army. In this literature, Inoue's ideas on Sokō played a crucial role, suggesting as they did that the martial ethic of *bushidō* was the traditional ethic of the Japanese people, and that at its most heroic level it involved willingness to die for one's emperor as the *rōnin* had died, supposedly following Sokō's teachings, for their *daimyō*.

For example, another proponent of *kokumin dōtoku* similar to Inoue, Kiyohara Sadao 清原貞雄(1885-1964), authored works such as *Bushidō shi* 武士道史(History of *bushidō*, 1927), *Shisōteki senkakusha to shite no Yamaga Sokō* 思想的先覚者としての山鹿素行(Yamaga Sokō as an enlightened thinker, 1930), and *Nippon kokumin no seishin* 日本国民の精神(The spirit of the Japanese people, 1931). In his *Nippon dōtoku* 日本道徳(Japanese ethics, 1927), Kiyohara, like Inoue, linked Sokō's ideas to the Akō *rōnin*, Yoshida Shōin, and late-Tokugawa *sonnō* ("revere the emperor") thought.⁴² Implied, of course, was that Japanese ethics largely consisted in *bushidō*, a teaching which readied its practitioners for martyrdom on behalf of emperor and nation.

A similar interpretation surfaced in Watari Shōzaburō's 亙理章三郎 *Kokumin dōtoku joron* 国民道徳序論 (Introduction to Japanese ethics), published in 1929.⁴³ Along with his contributions on national ethics, Watari is perhaps best known for his 1933 treatise, *Dai Nippon teikoku kokki* 大日本帝国国旗(On the national flag of imperial Japan). Also, in a 1931 essay, "Bushidō and Related Problems," published in an anthology celebrating Professor Inoue's seventy-seventh year, Oda Nobutada 尾田信忠 praised him for having clarified links among Sokō, Shōin, and Nogi.⁴⁴ Oda suggested that given Inoue's erudition, there could be little doubt about Sokō's impact on the heroic deeds of Nogi, or his definition of *bushidō* as the basis of a national creed. Even Tokutomi Sohō 徳富蘇峰 (1863-1957), an early "Westernizer," recognized Inoue's contributions to Japanese understandings of the *rōnin* vendetta. Tokutomi also acknowledged that Yamaga Sokō's teachings were behind the vendetta, citing as "proof" the fact that both Dazai Shundai and Satō Naokata had blamed the vendetta on Sokō's teachings.⁴⁵

Inoue's views were so widely accepted that by the early 1930s, some of those whom Inoue had once criticized came to recant their ideas and endorse his regarding Sokō and *bushidō*. Inoue, for example, had attacked Nitobe's *Bushidō* for its failure to mention Sokō in relation to *bushidō*. Recognizing Inoue's insights, Nitobe subsequently included Sokō in his accounts of *bushidō*. Thus, in his 1931 work, *Japan: Some Phases of Her Problems and Development*, Nitobe, while insisting that *bushidō* was "not a system of any kind," acknowledged that "the nearest approach to a systematic presentation" of it had been made by "Yamaga Sokō in the middle of the seventeenth century." Nitobe praised Sokō as "a patriot to the core" insofar as he insisted on the

⁴² Kiyohara Sadao, *Nippon dōtoku* (Tokyo: Kaizōsha, 1927), pp. 51-53.

⁴³ Watari Shōzaburō, *Kokumin dōtoku joron* (Tokyo: Chūbunkan shoten, 1929), p. 349.

⁴⁴ Oda Nobutada, "Bushidō to bushidō mondai" 武士道と武士道問題, in *Inoue sensei kiju kinen bunshū* 井上先生喜寿記念文集 (Tokyo: Fuzanbō, 1931), pp. 42-46.

⁴⁵ Tokutomi Sohō, *Kokuminteki kyōyō* 国民的教養 (Tokyo: Minyūsha, 1925), pp. 399-403.

superiority of Japan in his *Chūchō jijitsu*, even in an age when most scholars regarded China as the model for everything. Nitobe admitted that there were many who admired and followed Sokō, including men who had left “an indelible impress upon the soul of the nation.” Echoing Inoue, Nitobe added that some of the most famous followers of Sokō included “Ōishi [Yoshio], the leader of the Forty-Seven *Rōnin*, Yoshida Shōin, an eminent pioneer of the Meiji era, [and] Nogi, the hero of Port Arthur.” Nitobe asserted that the vital precepts of *bushidō* lived on, “clothed in a new garb.” He thus cited “National Ethics” (*kokumin dōtoku*) as one example which conveyed “all that was inculcated in *Bushidō*.” Paying further homage to Inoue, Nitobe added that the Imperial Rescript on Education—for which Inoue had written the Monbushō-commissioned commentary—itsself embodied *bushidō*.⁴⁶

Another indication of the prevalence of Inoue’s views on Sokō, Shōin, and Nogi is their presence in *shūshinsho*修身書, or ethics texts used in public school education. *Kokutai no hongī* 国体の本義 (Cardinal principles of our national polity), for example, opened its account of “The Inherent Character of the People” by quoting Sokō’s *Chūchō jijitsu*: “The Land of Japan stands high above the other nations of the world and her people excel the peoples of the world.” Discussing *bushidō*, it claimed that it revealed “an outstanding characteristic of our national morality.” Regarding the history of *bushidō* as a systematic code, *Kokutai no hongī* explained,

Yamaga Sokō, Matsumiya Kanzan, and Yoshida Shōin were all men of the most devout character who exercised much influence in bringing *Bushidō* to perfection. It is this same *Bushidō* that shed itself of the outdated feudalism at the time of the Meiji Restoration, increased in splendor, became the Way of loyalty and patriotism, and has evolved before us as the spirit of the Imperial Forces.

Elsewhere, *Kokutai no hongī* grouped Sokō’s *Chūchō jijitsu* with the Mito school’s *Dai Nihon shi* 大日本史 (History of the great Japan) and the pro-imperial writings of Yamazaki Ansai’s school for having emphasized “the great principle of reverence for the throne.”⁴⁷ Other less infamous *shūshin* texts equally emphasized the early samurai training received by Yoshida Shōin and General Nogi, suggesting that their imperial loyalism issued from the same sort of training that students of *shūshinsho* received. Implied, of course, was that similarly heroic deeds would be expected of the latter students.⁴⁸

One of the most popular volumes to appear echoing Inoue’s views was the juvenile work of historical fiction, *Ōishi Yoshio*, published in November of 1936. By 1943, it had been through eight editions. Its author, Takagi Giken 高木義賢, while

⁴⁶ Nitobe Inazō, *Japan: Some Phases of Her Problems and Development* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1931), pp. 360-61. For a recent study of Nitobe, see Thomas W. Burkman, “Nitobe Inazō: From World Order to Regional Order,” *Culture and Identity: Japanese Intellectuals During the Interwar Years*, ed. J. Thomas Rimer (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990), pp. 191-216.

⁴⁷ John Owen Gauntlett, translator, *Kokutai no hongī: Cardinal Principles of the National Entity of Japan* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949), pp. 129, 145, 118.

⁴⁸ Robert Hall King, *Shūshin: The Ethics of a Defeated Nation* (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teacher’s College, Columbia University, 1949), pp. 111-13, 119-21, 126-27 135-36.

basing his claims on others which passed as “history,” took liberties with even the most basic facts. For example, in relating that Sokō was Yoshio’s teacher, rather than recounting that Yoshio was seventeen when Sokō’s exile in Akō ended, Takagi added five years to Yoshio’s age, making him a more manly twenty-two year old. Moreover, Takagi stated that Yoshio was among those Akō samurai serving Sokō as bodyguards escorting him to Akō. During Sokō’s passage from Edo to Akō, the various routes departing from Edo were, according to Takagi, carefully watched by thousands of Sokō’s disciples, enraged that their master was being banished. Supposedly these followers were armed, even with rifles, ready to attack anyone who threatened Sokō with physical harm. Takagi, launching into another flight of fantasy, claimed that Sokō incurred the wrath of the *bakufu* by explaining, in a book on military strategy, the best way to attack and destroy Chiyoda Castle!⁴⁹ Much like Inoue, Takagi noted that General Nogi had studied Sokō’s writings on samurai ethics (*bushikun* 武士訓) and military strategy (*heihō* 兵法). In concluding his account of Yoshio, Takagi fabricated the circumstances surrounding the Meiji emperor’s entrance to Tokyo in 1868, when he sent an imperial message to the grave site of Yoshio and the other Akō *rōnin*, remembering their heroic deed and praising them for it.⁵⁰

A counterpart to Takagi’s *Ōishi Yoshio*, perhaps meant for high school students as opposed to those still in elementary school, appeared in 1943 with Hirao Kojō’s 平尾孤城 *Yamaga Sokō to Ōishi Yoshio* 山鹿素行と大石良雄. Well illustrated and simply written, Hirao’s volume opens with pictures of a bronze statue of Sokō, presumably as he appeared in Akō during his exile; a wooden statue of Ōishi Yoshio, preserved at the Kagaku Temple 花岳寺 in Akō; the text of the Emperor Meiji’s “message” sent to Ōishi Yoshio’s grave, November 5, 1868; a handscroll depicting Akō Castle; a folding screen of the Akō *gishi*; Yoshio’s family homeplace; a painting of Yoshio’s suicide at the Hosokawa mansion; and the *torii* of the Ōishi shrine 大石神社 located on the grounds of Akō Castle. Hirao’s claims also amplify Inoue’s at every turn. Thus, like Inoue, Hirao cited Yoshida Shoin’s claim that the *rōnin* vendetta, from beginning to end, was based on the teachings of Yamaga Sokō. Most directly those teachings were communicated to Yoshio.⁵¹

Without detailing Hirao’s every debt to Inoue, suffice it to note that he followed *Nippon kogakuha no tetsugaku* in identifying Sokō as the founder of “ancient learning” in Japan, a kind of learning which, in its emphasis on practice and practicality, developed from a generic, “Asian ancient learning” (*Tōyōteki kogaku* 東洋的古学) into a “samurai-centered ancient learning” (*shidō kogaku* 士道古学), and then finally into a “national essence ancient learning” (*kokutai kogaku* 国体古学), emphasizing the history, polity, and especially the spirituality of Japan. Regarding the latter, Hirao emphasized three spiritual legacies (*sandai seishin* 三大精神) of Sokō’s thought for modern Japan: first, national autonomy (*Nippon kokka jishu* 日本国家自主); second, a source of strength and power for the eternal development of the Japanese race (*Nippon minzoku eien hatten no genryoku* 日本民族永遠発展の原力); and third, faith in the fusion of divinity and

⁴⁹ Takagi Giken 高木義賢, ed., *Ōishi Yoshio* 大石良雄 (Tokyo: Dai Nippon yūbenkai, Kōdansha, 1943), pp. 45-55.

⁵⁰ Takagi, ed., *Ōishi Yoshio*, pp. 409-10.

⁵¹ Hirao Kojō 平尾孤城, *Yamaga Sokō to Ōishi Yoshio* (Tokyo: Echigoya shobō, 1943), pp. 9.

humanity within Japan (*Nippon shinjin yūgō no jishin* 日本神人融合の自身).⁵² Hirao added that these legacies culminated in the “movement to transform the eight directions into a single imperial universe” (*hakkō ichiu undō* 八紘一字運動), which was the guiding spirit for imperial Japan in the “Greater East Asian War.” Such, Hirao claimed, was the proper explanation of Sokō’s spiritual legacy for Japan. That legacy was alive and well and had become the destiny of Japan’s youth.⁵³

The extent to which Inoue’s interpretations came to be accepted as common knowledge is also evident in cultural productions charged with overtly ideological themes. A noteworthy dramatic reinterpretation of the Akō vendetta, *Genroku Chūshingura* 元禄忠臣蔵, thus recognized, despite the lack of historical evidence and theatrical precedent, Sokō as the teacher of the *rōnin*, and the existence of an imperial sanction for their deeds. Written by Mayama Seika 真山青果 (1878-1948) between 1934 and 1942, *Genroku Chūshingura* was a modern version of the Tokugawa puppet theater classic, *Chūshingura*, which had fascinated audiences for generations. Donald Keene relates that Mayama’s play was “the most massive attempt ever made to satisfy audiences whose curiosity had been whetted by fictional presentation of the *Chūshingura* themes.”

Undeniably, it seems, there were also ideological objectives written into the script. *Genroku Chūshingura* includes a lengthy passage wherein Ōishi Yoshio expresses his embarrassment that people saw him and the others as “great heroes.” Yoshio protests that they are just “ordinary men” who have done nothing more than their duty. In having the hero describe himself and his comrades in such quotidian terms, Mayama probably meant to encourage ordinary Japanese to similar self-sacrificing acts of heroism, albeit for the imperial cause. The imperial connection is made more explicit in the second act where Mayama has a member of the Asano clan report that the emperor’s sympathies were with Yoshio. Prior to this, Yoshio had worried that his late lord’s attack on the *bakufu* master of ceremonies, which occurred during a reception of imperial representatives, might be construed as *lèse majesté*. He was therefore relieved that the emperor and many nobles conveyed their regrets that Naganori had been unsuccessful. Given that Mayama explicitly recognized Sokō as the teacher of the *rōnin*, such a concern for the imperial throne perhaps seemed natural to many who had imbibed Inoue’s interpretation of Sokō’s legacy. Keene, noting that the connection to the emperor was more typical of the 1930s and its thinking than of Tokugawa Japan, suggests that Mayama could not resist the temptation to extend this kind of emperor-centered loyalty to his samurai heroes, anachronistic though it may have been.⁵⁴ Another possibility is that by Mayama’s time alleged links between Sokō, the Akō vendetta, and pro-imperialistic thought were so widely accepted that Mayama never considered their inclusion a matter

⁵² Ibid., pp. 124-25.

⁵³ Ibid., p. 126. Another work which reflects Inoue’s analyses in tracing Sokō’s impact from the *rōnin*, to Yoshida Shōin, and finally to General Nogi, is Hashimoto Minoru’s 橋本実 *Nippon bushidō shi* 日本武士道史 (Tokyo: Chijin shokan, 1940), pp. 230-35. Also see Sasagawa Taneo 笹川種郎, *Akō gishi kenkyū* 赤穂義士研究 (Tokyo: Daitō shokan, 1942), pp. 26-27.

⁵⁴ Donald Keene, “Variations on a Theme: Chūshingura,” *Chūshingura: Studies in Kabuki and the Puppet Theatre*, ed. James R. Brandon (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1982), pp. 13, 6-7, 14-15. For a different, perhaps less convincing reading of Mayama’s play, see Brian Powell, “The Samurai Ethic in Mayama Seika’s *Genroku Chūshingura*,” *Modern Asian Studies* 18.4 (October 1984), pp. 725-45.

of choice: rather, it amounted to little more than repetition of the received scholarly wisdom of Inoue and others who had come to rehearse his judgments on Sokō and the *rōnin* as holy writs.

Keene acknowledges that Mayama's drama resonated with, and to an extent promoted, the political concerns of the mid-1930s. He notes, for example, how Yoshio was deemed "the embodiment of samurai ideals which seemed of special importance in the late-1930s." This, Keene notes, paralleled the belief of Mayama's contemporaries that "Japan's military actions in China were inspired by righteous ideals and not merely by expedients."⁵⁵ Keene also observes that Mayama's play "insists on the differences between Japanese and Chinese—a theme of particular relevance in the 1930s." Though Keene does not relate this way of thinking directly to Sokō, that could easily be done and may have been one of Mayama's assumptions, given the conventional wisdom of the 1930s that Sokō, theorist of Japanese superiority vis-à-vis China, had also taught the *rōnin*. Certainly, Mayama was doing more than entertaining Japanese by innocently revitalized plots. In declaring, for example, that "people all over Japan are looking to the *rōnin* for proof that the samurai code of *Bushidō* still exists,"⁵⁶ Mayama was subliminally challenging his audience to emulate the same code, one which Inoue had most closely associated with Sokō's name since the early 1900s.

The popular visual arts also promoted the same conventional wisdom about Sokō and the *rōnin*. The *Yamato sakura* 大和桜 (Cherry blossoms of imperial Japan), published in 1935, included sixty depictions of samurai exploits in Japanese history, beginning with the battle between the august deity Susanoō 素戔 and a dragon, a scene famous in imperial lore because it was by cutting the dragon open that Susanoō obtained the sword which became one of the three treasures of the imperial throne. The second featured Emperor Jinmu 神武 standing emblazoned by the rising sun, presiding over the military rise of Yamato 大和 imperial rule.

The fifty-eighth, depicting the *rōnin*, featured a caption exclaiming, "The Righteous Samurai of Akō Domain Whose Honor Will Instruct One Thousand Generations." The *rōnin* are then praised for acting like true samurai in taking revenge on their deceased master's enemy. As if it were common knowledge that needed no explanation, the caption added that Yoshio led the attack with tactics taught by Sokō. This was followed by a depiction of the assassination of Ii Naosuke 井伊直弼 (1815-60), the architect of the Ansei Purge which had resulted in the beheading of Sokō's famous late-Tokugawa disciple, Yoshida Shōin. The final depiction portrayed anti-Tokugawa (i.e., Chōshū) forces, which had been influenced by Shōin's (and thus Sokō's) teachings, defeating pro-*bakufu* troops.⁵⁷ Insofar as these three *rōnin*-dominated scenes from Tokugawa "history" concluded the artistic survey presented in the *Yamato sakura*, the work clearly implied that Sokō's teachings constituted the ascendant source of warrior strength culminating with the Meiji revival of imperial rule. Noteworthy is the fact that Sokō and his disciples—the *rōnin*, the assassins of Ii Naosuke, and the anti-*bakufu*, pro-Meiji forces—were all presented in heroic, ever-victorious roles. *Yamato sakura* meant

⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 17.

⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 19.

⁵⁷ Kokushi meiga kankōkai 国史名画刊行会, eds., *Yamato sakura* (Tokyo: Shōbunsha, 1935), pp. 58-59.

to suggest that Sokō's legacy in *bushidō* would provide modern Japan with similar success in pro-imperial warfare.

Sokō's prominence in militaristic literature reflected Inoue's interpretation of him as the key theorist of *bushidō* in Japanese history. Such prominence is highly evident in the 1936 monograph, *Wa Kan Yō tōsui yōdan* 和漢洋統帥余談 (Japanese, Chinese, and European masters of military strategy) by General Ōmura Arichika 大村有隣. The latter spotlighted Sokō's *Bukyō zensho*, Sunzi's 孫子 *Bingfa* 兵法 (Art of warfare), and Carl von Clausewitz's (1780-1831) *On War (Vom Kriege)* as texts most representative of the three military traditions. While admitting that imperial Japan's understanding of strategy had been influenced by China and the West, Ōmura suggested that Japanese strategists, in drawing on *bushidō*, as defined in Tokugawa Japan by Sokō, were superior to those of Europe and China.⁵⁸

Other militaristic literature featured Sokō less prominently, though certainly crucially, as the teacher and inspiration of Yoshida Shōin. For example, in a 1938 text, *Shina ni atauru sho* 支那に与ふる書 (Books we should send China), by Hanada Nakanosuke 花田仲之助 (b. 1868), the writings of Yoshida Shōin were singled out as ones from which Chinese could most benefit. Shōin's writings should be read so that Chinese could absorb his thinking on *kokutai*. The latter, Hanada claimed, derived from Sokō. Hanada added, however, that Shōin stressed Sokō's pro-imperialist and pro-nationalistic ideas at a more thoroughgoing level, that of *tennō chūshin shugi* 天皇中心主義, or "imperialism," than Sokō had. Hanada pointed out that Sokō believed, in good Confucian fashion, that the foundation of any state is its people; Shōin, on the other hand, insisted that the emperor was the crucial force. Because its imperial house had never once been overthrown, Japan was deemed "an immortal divine land." For the same reason, Hanada deduced, Japanese are not national citizens; instead, they are subjects who absolutely submit to their imperial line. Thus *tenka* 天下, or "the-nation," does not belong to itself, but instead to the emperor. Making this point more forcefully, Hanada added that even if tyrants like those of ancient China, Jie and Zhou, oppressed the Japanese, they would never dare overthrow such rulers as was the common practice in China and other countries.⁵⁹

With Hanada's *Shina ni atauru sho*, writings extolling Sokō and his legacy in Shōin took a more militaristic, imperialistic, and aggressively expansionist tack. For example, Hanada characterized Shōin's belief, derived from Sokō's *Chūchō jijitsu*, that Japan was superior to China as *dai Tōyō shugi* 大東洋主義, or "Greater East Asianism." The latter was Shōin's ultimate principle, one which would culminate, with military conquest of the region, in peace throughout Asia as led by imperial Japan.⁶⁰ Hanada's book featured a preface by Matsuoka Yōsuke 松岡洋介 (1880-1946), then president of the South Manchurian Railway Company and an advisor to the Kono cabinet. It was Matsuoka, incidentally, who had announced, in 1933, Japan's walkout from the League of Nations following the Lytton Commission Report calling for Japanese withdrawal from Manchuria. Matsuoka was arrested as a class "A" war criminal after the war, but

⁵⁸ Ōmura Arichika, *Wa Kan Yō tōsui yōdan* (Tokyo: Kaikōsha, 1938).

⁵⁹ Hanada Nakanosuke, *Shina ni atauru sho* (Tokyo: Daiichi shuppansha, 1938), pp. 86-89, 90-92.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 108.

died before trial. Another preface was authored by General Araki Sadao 荒木貞夫 (1877-1966), then Minister of Education. In 1933, Araki contributed to the growing imperialistic and militaristic literature by authoring *Kōkoku no gunjin seishin* 皇国の軍人精神 (The spirit of the military forces of imperial Japan). After the war, Araki was sentenced to life imprisonment as a class “A” war criminal, but was released in 1955 for health reasons. Matsuoka and Araki praised Hanada’s book, hailing it as one which could facilitate cooperation between imperial Japan and China, enabling them to make achievements in industry and culture comparable to those of the West.⁶¹

In 1941, Kobayashi Ichirō 小林一郎 (1876-1944), published a new edition of two of Sokō’s more important works, *Shindō* 臣道 (The way of the subject) and *Bukyō shōgaku* 武経小学 (Elementary learning for samurai) as the first part of a series published in twelve volumes and entitled *Kōkoku seishin kōza* 皇国精神講座 (Imperial Japan’s spiritual foundations). In his “Preface,” Kobayashi contrasted Japan with Western nations by noting how countries like Great Britain, France, and Russia had expanded into India, China, and Siberia by force, without regard for either justice or morality. After insisting that international relations be based on *seigi* 正義, or “justice,” Kobayashi claimed that Japan, since its founding by Emperor Jinmu, had exemplified such justice as *kōdō* 公道, or “the way of impartiality,” and *wa* 和, or “harmony.”⁶² Kobayashi emphasized that achieving *wa* involved spiritually discarding *watakushi* 私, or “selfish, personal tendencies,” and acting instead for the sake of *ōyake* 公, or “the public good.”⁶³ In this context Kobayashi introduced *bushidō*, calling it Japan’s most esteemed spiritual ethic. Citing Kusunoki Masashige 楠木正成 (d. 1336) as an example of true *bushi* behavior, Kobayashi noted how Masashige never gave a thought to himself when it was necessary to act on behalf of the imperial family. Though Masashige embodied true *bushidō*, he did not record any explanations of it. Only in the Tokugawa period did scholars set down, Kobayashi claimed, what *bushidō* involved. One such scholar was Yamaga Sokō.⁶⁴

In his “Introduction,” Kobayashi stated his views on Sokō and the *rōnin*. Like Inoue, Kobayashi claimed that Sokō served the Asano family for nineteen years, suggesting that Sokō resided in Akō the entire time, and implying that Sokō’s decade of exile in Akō amounted to a form of “service” to the Asano family. Also like Inoue, Kobayashi exaggerated Sokō’s impact, stating that the transformative power of his teachings was so great that among his disciples were the “forty-seven samurai.” Kobayashi praised Ōishi Yoshio as a superlative samurai, one who excelled because he had imbibed Sokō’s teachings. Kobayashi also praised Sokō’s *Chūchō jijitsu* for recognizing his nation, not China, as “the true Central Empire.”⁶⁵ Kobayashi lauded

⁶¹ Ibid., pp. 9-14.

⁶² Kobayashi Ichirō, *Shindō/Bukyō shōgaku* (Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1941), pp. 17-27.

⁶³ Ibid., pp. 28-31.

⁶⁴ Ibid., pp. 31-39.

⁶⁵ Cf. Maruyama Masao, “Nationalism in Japan: Its Theoretical Background and Prospects,” in *Thought and Behavior in Modern Japanese Politics*, ed. Ivan Morris (New York: Oxford University Press, 1963), p. 149. Maruyama notes that while Japan appropriated China’s “notion of being the ‘Central Kingdom,’” China’s mission idea focused on cultural superiority whereas Japan’s always rested on military superiority as its indispensable though not its only base.”

Sokō as a scholar of *bushidō* the likes of whom the world had never known, before or since. Additionally, Sokō taught the way of the subject, not just as a matter of research, but as a practical discipline, as evidenced in the loyalty of Akō samurai to their lord.

Kobayashi admitted that the way of the subject which Sokō taught, had Chinese roots, but he insisted that such teachings had been ignored in China in favor of Mencian notions which, he claimed, legitimized the murder of rulers by subjects and fathers by sons. Sokō had called attention to such atrocities and denounced China for them. Sokō also reminded Japanese that their history was unique because their imperial line had never been disgraced by such treachery. Japan's *kokutai* was, as Sokō described it, one wherein subjects would not even discuss the possibility of overthrowing a ruler. Along with such views, Kobayashi presented his readers with new editions of Sokō's *Shindō* and *Bukyō shōgaku* so as to inculcate them in the spirit of Japan's *kokutai*, one decisively different from that of China, and one which, in Kobayashi's view, was indisputably superior.⁶⁶ In 1942, Kobayashi continued his explication of such themes, editing a two-volume edition of Sokō's *Chūchō jijitsu* for the *Kōkoku seishin kōza* series.

In a 1943 monograph, *Yamaga Sokō no kokutai kan* 山鹿素行の国体観 (Yamaga Sokō's view of Japan's national essence), Nōtomi Yoshitake 納富誠武 similarly recapitulated many of Inoue's interpretations of Sokō. Nōtomi's work included the *Chūchō jijitsu*, along with a modern translation of it. Before presenting that text, Nōtomi recounted the basic elements of Sokō's life more or less as they were presented in Inoue's *Nippon kogakuha no tetsugaku*. Another link to Inoue appears in the opening quotation in *Yamaga Sokō no kokutai kan*: an abridged version of Nogi's speech delivered before Sokō's grave on October 29, 1907, announcing Sokō's receipt, posthumously, of fourth imperial rank, junior level.⁶⁷ More than Inoue, Nōtomi emphasized Sokō's pro-imperial, pro-Japan philosophy, one he characterized as *Nippon chūchōshugi* 日本中朝主義, or the doctrine that Japan, not China, was the true Central Empire. Also Nōtomi recalled that the Emperor Meiji had visited an exhibition of Sokō's personal effects, including his dress sword, his short sword, his coat-of-arms, his seal, his diary, and his letter to Hōjō Ujinaga 北條氏長 written when summoned by the latter to be sentenced to exile. Shortly after viewing these, the Meiji emperor had Sokō honored posthumously.⁶⁸

Nōtomi also charted Sokō's impact on later Japan via essentially the same genealogy that Inoue had crafted, pointing first to Sokō's impact on the *rōnin*, or *gishi* as he referred to them, and then recalling Sokō's subsequent influence on Shōin in the late Tokugawa and on General Nogi in late-Meiji Japan. Despite the fact that Sokō had no long list of disciples comparable to those of Jinsai or Sorai, Nōtomi insisted, as Inoue had, that Sokō's impact was still considerable. In particular, Nōtomi attributed the "iron and steel resolution" of the *rōnin* to their transformation by Sokō's teachings. Nōtomi also argued that the Akō vendetta was wholly consistent with all of Sokō's teachings, including those of *shidō*, *shindō*, and *seigaku* 聖学 or sagely Confucian learning.⁶⁹ Like Inoue, Nōtomi credited Sokō with having pioneered the systematic, theoretical development of *bushidō*. Nōtomi admitted that the word *bushidō* was a modern term, but he claimed that its *seishin*, or "essential spirit," was traceable to the primordial age of the

⁶⁶ Kobayashi, *Shindō/Bukyō shōgaku*, pp. 52-68.

⁶⁷ Nōtomi Yoshitake, *Yamaga Sokō no kokutai kan* (Tokyo: Kaku shobō, 1943), p. 2.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 50.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 41, 86-87.

kami.⁷⁰ Nōtomi additionally praised Sokō for having proclaimed the superiority of Japan over China, or the principle of *Nippon chūchōshugi* as he called it, nearly three centuries before the Greater East Asian War began.

One of the most significant voices to emerge in Sokō-related discourse of the 1920s and 1930s was that of Imperial Navy Captain Hirose Yutaka 広瀬豊, the future editor of the definitive edition of the *Yamaga Sokō zenshū* (Complete works of Yamaga Sokō), published during the early 1940s by Iwanami shoten. Captain Hirose's 1927 work *Gunjin shōkun* 軍人小訓 (Elementary instructions for military personnel), published by the Bushidō Research Society, featured two prefaces, one by Admiral Ōba Jirō 大庭次郎 and the other by Admiral Katō Kanji 加藤寛治. Although *Gunjin shōkun* is not a study of Sokō, it does quote and/or allude to Sokō regularly in treating topics such as the nature of bravery. In this context Captain Hirose introduced details related to General Nogi's life and intellectual development, as well as tales about Kusunoki Masashige and Yoshida Shōin. Regarding Sokō's impact on the *rōnin*, Hirose related how the vendetta reflected samurai values in both its complex planning and its poignancy. Furthermore, Hirose claimed that in the intricacies of the vendetta, one saw the *okugi* 奥義, or "esoteric nuances," of Sokō's martial philosophy. In yet another reiteration of Inoue's views on Sokō, Hirose concluded his text by stating that Sokō's *Bukyō shōgaku* was "the constitution of *bushidō*."⁷¹

Hirose's clearest endorsement of Inoue's thesis appeared in *Bushidō no taigi* 武士道の大義, a work published by the Gunjishi gakkai 軍事史学会 in 1943. While the anthology includes materials on the "*bushidō*" of the Mito 水戸 School, that of the *Taiheiki* 太平記, and Daidōji Yūzan 大道寺友山, the first major division of *Bushidō no taigi* following its "Introduction" examines the Yamaga School's understanding of "the great duty" (*taigi* 大義) of *bushidō*. There Hirose characterized Sokō's *bushidō* as a kind of "national essence *bushidō*" (*kokutai bushidō* 国体武士道) and "imperialist *bushidō*" (*kinnō bushidō* 勤皇武士道) and asserted that it was fully accepted by the leader of Akō domain and all who followed him. Hirose claimed that it was during Sokō's second period in Akō, while in exile there, that his *bushidō* attained its highest level of expression as the *kokutai-kinnō* teachings. It was then that Yoshio studied with Sokō. Discounting claims that Yoshio had been a student of Jinsai's, Hirose added that that was a temporary diversion in Yoshio's development. Moreover, Hirose speculated that in the decade after Sokō's exile in Akō had ended, Yoshio probably traveled to Edo with his lord, and there encountered Sokō, further enabling him to imbibe Sokō's *bushidō* as it developed in Sokō's final years.⁷² Thus Hirose's speculations sought to multiply the opportunities Yoshio had to have studied Sokō's teachings.

⁷⁰ Ibid., pp. 52-53.

⁷¹ Hirose Yutaka, *Gunjin shōkun* (Tokyo: Bushidō kenkyūkai, 1927), pp. 35-37, 53, 74, 86-87, 139. For an English translation of *Budō shoshinshū*, see A. L. Sadler, transl., *The Code of the Samurai: A Translation of Daidōji Yūzan's Budō Shoshinshū* (Rutland: Charles Tuttle Co., 1988 reprint of the 1941 edition).

⁷² Hirose Yutaka, "Yamaga Sokō bushidō no taigi" 山鹿素行武士道の大義 in Satō Kenji 佐藤堅司, ed., *Bushidō no taigi* 武士道の大義 (Tokyo: Shūeisha, 1943), pp. 77-80.

The *Hagakure*, Sokō, and the *Rōnin*

If any “traditional” theme came to rival and perhaps displace those adumbrated by Inoue, and starring Sokō, the *rōnin*, Yoshida Shōin, and General Nogi, it was that of *bushidō* and death, especially as expressed in the *Hagakure* 葉隠.⁷³ The latter text emerged, in part, as an early critique of the Akō vendetta, not because the vendetta was considered criminal but rather due to the relative slowness of its execution. The *Hagakure* would have had the *rōnin* take revenge immediately, without waiting to formulate careful plans and strategies. While the latter might have helped to ensure ultimate success, there was never any guarantee that the enemy, Lord Kira Yoshinaka 吉良義央 (1641-1792), would live long enough to allow revenge against him to be realized. The *Hagakure* critique of the *rōnin* was not particularly compelling in Tokugawa times because the *rōnin* had succeeded, in a most astounding way. And, the vast majority of those writing about the vendetta lauded the *rōnin* as righteous samurai.

The *Hagakure* also defined the way of the samurai as a meditation on death, one granting little value to anything other. Again, its message had relatively little appeal in an age when samurai were redefining themselves in more civil and political ways. Also, the *Hagakure* was not a popular “*bushidō*” text early in the twentieth century when Japanese scholars of the ancient ethic, such as Nitobe and Inoue, were primarily concerned with explaining Japan’s astounding military victories over the Chinese and Russians. Rather, Sokō’s teachings, insofar as they supposedly engendered the success of the *rōnin* vendetta, seemed more appropriate. However, in the 1930s and 1940s, as imperial victories involved increasing sacrifices, *bushidō* rhetoric became more macabre, and the *Hagakure* emerged increasingly as a central topic in the discourse, displacing the upbeat, ever-victorious *bushidō* Inoue championed.

An early text signaling the new prominence of the *Hagakure* was Nagayoshi Jirō’s 永吉二郎 *Nippon bushidō shi* 日本武士道史 (History of Japanese *bushidō*), published in 1932. This text featured an “Introduction” by Major General Matsuda Kenpei 松田券平 extolling the many displays of Japan’s national spirit, *bushidō*, among military and civilians (*ippan kokumin* 一般国民), during the recent Manchurian (September 1931) and Shanghai (January 1932) Incidents. Major General Matsuda lauded *bushidō* as the motivating “force behind the nation’s emergence” (*kokka kōryū no gendōryoku* 国家興隆の原動力), and praised Nagayoshi’s text as an aid in educating Japanese, especially its young (*seinen* 青年), in this “spirit.”⁷⁴ A second introduction, authored by Kiyohara Sadao 清原貞雄 (1885-1964) and based on the speech he delivered upon the fiftieth anniversary of the 1882 “Imperial Rescript for Soldiers and Sailors” (*Gunjin chokuyū* 軍人勅諭), praised Nagayoshi’s work for advancing research on Japan’s “national ethics” (*Nippon kokumin dōtoku shisō* 日本国民道德思想) along

⁷³ Mishima Yukio’s promotion of the *Hagakure* is another reason for its popularity in the West. See Kathryn Spalding, transl., *The Way of the Samurai: Yukio Mishima on Hagakure in Modern Life* (New York: Basic Books, 1977). The best modern edition of the *Hagakure* is Saiki Kazuma 齋木一馬 et al., eds., *Mikawa monogatari/Hagakure* 三河物語・葉隠, *Nihon shisō taikai*, vol. 26 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1974).

⁷⁴ Matsuda Kenpei 松田券平, “Introduction,” in Nagayoshi Jirō 永吉二郎, *Nippon bushidō shi* 日本武士道史 (Tokyo: Chūbunkan shoten, 1932), p. 1.

historically grounded and philosophically critical lines.⁷⁵ Nagayoshi's own "Introduction" was authored on the day of a special *matsuri*, or festival, at the Yasukuni Shrine 靖国神社 meant to enshrine military personnel who had recently died. Nagayoshi alluded to those who had sacrificed themselves, suggesting that their deeds culminated in the *Hi no maru* flying over the entire world.⁷⁶

Nagayoshi traced *bushidō* back to the founding of Japan, making it the story of the nation itself. In this context, he cited Yamaga Sokō more as a thinker who integrated Confucianism, and its ethics of humaneness and rightness (*jingi* 仁義), into *bushidō*, than the first to expound it systematically. Nagayoshi also credited Sokō with pioneering *bushidō* as a subject of education, i.e., as a set of doctrines that should be learned and studied. Along side this explication of Sokō's thought, however, Nagayoshi introduced another aspect of *bushidō*, that linked to the *Hagakure* and its supposed teachings on "madness to die" (*shinikurui* 死狂い). And while following Inoue's claim that the *rōnin* vendetta had flowed from Sokō's teachings, Nagayoshi quoted the *Hagakure* critique of the *rōnin*, noting that had Lord Kira died before the vendetta, it would have brought shame and disgrace to the *rōnin* and their deceased lord. Without simply praising the *Hagakure*, Nagayoshi, by introducing it into his discourse on Sokō and the *rōnin*, implied that perhaps the vendetta was not utterly impeccable. Possibly, he suggested, it could have been more perfect had it been more immediate and less cautious, i.e., had it exhibited more of the *shinikuri* characteristic of the *Hagakure*, and less of the calculation associated with Sokō's learned *bushidō*.⁷⁷

Another work offering the *Hagakure* as a more "wild to die" alternative to Sokō's *bushidō* was Lieutenant General Horiuchi Bunjirō's 堀内文次郎 *Bushidō no hongī* 武士道の本義 (Essential principles of *bushidō*), published in 1939. Incidentally, Horiuchi's text features calligraphy by then Minister of Education, General Araki Sadao. Horiuchi's "Introduction" states that he authored the text to explicate the meaning of *Nippon bushidō* for young people (*seinen*), both male and female. Horiuchi discusses Sokō's thought in relation to the theme of "the way of death" (*shi no michi* 死の道), suggesting that while Sokō recognized death as an ultimate duty of *bushi*, the same line was even further developed in the *Hagakure*. Following discussions of death, including ways to die and the meaning of death, Horiuchi cites the cases of Kusunoki Masashige, Yoshida Shōin, and General Nogi as examples of the willingness to die which supposedly characterized *bushidō*. By including the latter two figures, and incorporating Sokō into themes more commonly associated with the *Hagakure*, Horiuchi and his promotion of "faith in certain death" (*kesshi no shinkō* 決死の信仰)⁷⁸ refocused Inoue's earlier explication of *bushidō*, moving it from a glorious ethic of invariable success to one demanding, as its culmination, self-sacrifice for an eternal cause.

Hada Takao's 羽田隆雄 *Bushidō to shidō* 武士道の師道 (*Bushidō* and the way of the samurai), also published in 1939, furthered a similar refocusing of Sokō studies by examining Sokō's *shidō* 士道 in relation to the "spirit" of the *Hagakure*. Written in the

⁷⁵ Kiyohara Sadao 清原貞雄, "Introduction," in Nagayoshi, *Nippon bushidō shi*, p. 2.

⁷⁶ Nagayoshi, "Introduction," *Nippon bushidō shi*, pp. 2-3.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 148-59, 222-29.

⁷⁸ Horiuchi Bunjirō 堀内文次郎, *Bushidō no hongī* 武士道の本義 (Tokyo: Monasu, 1939), pp. 221-72.

wake of the 1937 “China Incident,” which it described as an accomplishment in world history the likes of which Japan had never before achieved,⁷⁹ Hada’s text sought not to explain a completed victory but rather to enlist continuing and ultimate support for an ongoing, massive project. The abiding importance of Inoue’s writings is everywhere evident in Hada’s work, but most especially in his examination of Sokō wherein he cites “Professor Inoue,” especially his *Kokumin dōtoku gairon*, on several occasions.⁸⁰ But ultimately Hada’s intent was to mesh Soko’s *shidō* with, in a macabre pun, a different notion, “the way of death,” *shidō* 死道, especially as defined in the *Hagakure*. In doing this, Hada especially focused on Inoue’s claims about Sokō’s teachings and General Nogi as the embodiment of them. Again implied is that *bushidō* demanded a readiness to sacrifice one’s life. In Hada’s text, the cause demanding this was national unity directed toward “developing a new order in Asia.”⁸¹

Early Understandings of Sokō and the *Rōnin* in Western Writings

Intimations of the potency of Inoue’s views appeared in 1905, when Lafcadio Hearn’s *Japan: An Attempt at Interpretation* noted how one element of loyalism in old Japan which might serve it in modern times in the form of patriotism was that embodied in the Akō *rōnin* vendetta. Hearn conveyed the popularity of the *rōnin* by noting that Japanese often left business cards at the gravestones of the *rōnin* when they visited the Sengokuji. On his last visit, the “ground about the tombs was white with visiting cards.”⁸² Whether or not Hearn had read Inoue’s writings is unclear, but his remarks did appear just three years after Inoue’s study of the philosophy of the Japanese school of Ancient Learning had appeared.

Hearn was among the more famous Western commentators on Japan to notice the cultural prominence of *rōnin*. Others took note of *bushidō*, although in a more critical way. In the multi-volume 1901 publication, *Japan: Its History, Arts, and Literature*, part of an “Oriental Series” on China and Japan, an entire chapter was devoted to “Bushidō, or the Way of the Warrior.” The chapter claimed that *bushidō* was the religion of Japan insofar as it was “the source from which spring the motives of men’s noblest actions.” The chapter traced *bushidō* to some of the earliest poems in the Japanese literary tradition, ones expressing loyalism to the emperor. It then noted how the essential elements, “faith in the divinity of the sovereign, and absolute loyalty even to the unquestioning sacrifice of life,” made “a fine foundation for building a strong nation.” While acknowledging that post-Meiji patriotism and imperial loyalism, which had acquired “the character of a religion in modern Japan,” were real forces, the chapter denied that such modes of belief and behavior were, as far as historical evidence showed, either traditional or hereditary.⁸³

The chapter did not explicitly discuss Sokō in relation to *bushidō*, but did recognize him as one of the first advocates of strict military discipline, adding that Sokō

⁷⁹ Hada Takao 羽田隆雄, *Bushidō to shidō* 武士道と師道 (Tokyo: Hōfūkan, 1940), pp. 2-3.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 24, 28, 32.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 2-3.

⁸² Lafcadio Hearn, *Japan: An Attempt at Interpretation* (London: Macmillan Company, 1905), pp. 320-30.

⁸³ Captain F. Brinkley, *Japan, Its History, Arts, and Literature*, vol. II (Boston: J. B. Millett Co., 1901), pp. 173-76, 206-08, 210-21.

was more remembered as “the military instructor of Oishi Kuranosuke, the leader of the Forty-seven Ronin, than as the founder of a new school of tactics.” The chapter on “Bushi-dō” also included a photograph of the gravestones of the forty-seven rōnin.⁸⁴ Similar, albeit more critical, views were expressed by the experienced interpreter of Japan, Basil Hall Chamberlain (1850-1935). Chamberlain argued, in his brief treatise of 1912, *The Invention of a New Religion*, that the notion of *bushidō* was manufactured and promulgated by the ruling oligarchy of imperial Japan to legitimize and enhance their own power and prestige.⁸⁵ Far from being an enthusiastic admirer of *bushidō*, Chamberlain was apparently genuinely disgusted by the blatant jingoism evident in claims fabricating a new creed which would probably encourage further military aggression by Japan against its neighbors in Asia and the world.

Explicit scholarly endorsement of Professor Inoue’s views, at a relatively general level, came with Walter Dening’s 1908 review, published in the *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan*, of Inoue’s trilogy on Tokugawa Confucian philosophy. Mentioning Sokō, Dening related how he was exiled to Akō domain by the *bakufu* due to his opposition to the teachings of Zhu Xi. Because the Akō *daimyō* treated him kindly, Sokō taught his retainers with vigor, making such “an impression on them that a most powerful school of warrior-philosophers was founded in Harima (Akō), which in later times gave birth to the 47 *rōnin* type of heroes.” Dening also noted how Yoshida Shōin, the teacher of both Itō Hirobumi 伊藤博文 (1841-1909) and Yamagata Aritomo 山県有朋 (1838-1922), was Sokō’s most famous disciple in Chōshū domain. Dening also repeated, without question, Inoue’s characterization of Sokō as “a staunch nationalist” who “condemned in strong terms the tendency of his contemporaries to praise everything that was foreign and to depreciate things native.” Dening additionally highlighted Inoue’s characterization of Sokō as “one of the great founders of the Bushidō,” recalling how Inoue spoke of Sokō as “the *Verkörperung*, or incarnation, of the famous code,” his works forming “a kind of Bushidō Constitution.”⁸⁶

The extent to which Inoue’s views of Sokō came to prevail as common knowledge can also be seen in Sydney Greenbie’s *Japan Real and Imaginary*, published in 1920. Though Greenbie did not mention Sokō, he did draw on Inoue’s interpretations of Sokō by linking two of the more sensational details embedded in them. Prior to his account of Nogi’s suicide, Greenbie related the story of the Akō *rōnin*. Greenbie observed that “no act of loyalty in the whole history of Japan stands out more pure and free from personal advantage than the suicide of General Nogi. This self-sacrifice brings a thrill to every Japanese heart.” Unlike some Western interpreters of Japan, however, who simply endorsed Inoue’s view of *bushidō* as a crucial ingredient in traditional Japanese ethics, Greenbie acknowledged Chamberlain’s skeptical views in a footnote.⁸⁷ Echoes of Inoue’s ideas, and Chamberlain’s charges that the glorification of *bushidō* was part of an “invented religion,” occur in Upton Close’s *Challenge: Behind the Face of Japan*, published in 1934. Somewhat ominously, Close observes that “Japanese

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 169; illustration found between pp. 176 and 177.

⁸⁵ Basil Hall Chamberlain, *The Invention of a New Religion* (London: Watts & Co., 1912).

⁸⁶ Walter Dening, “Confucian Philosophy in Japan: Reviews of Dr. Inoue Tetsujirō’s Three Volumes on This Philosophy,” *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan* 36 (1908), pp. 120-22.

⁸⁷ Sydney Greenbie, *Japan Real and Imaginary* (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1920), pp. 446-48.

emotionalism,” which he sees as in part responsible for “the hysterical face” of the people,

is sanctified by the story, now sacred scripture, of the vendetta of Akō. The forty-seven ronin [sic.] have become the saints of the patriotic societies, and Tōyama [Mitsuru] claims that the Black Dragon Society [Kokuryūkai] originated with them. The story has become a classic inspiration of patriotism, the lesson of loyalty, self-sacrifice, perseverance and avengement drilled into all schoolchildren, hundreds of thousands of whom visit the tomb of the forty-seven ronin in Sengaku temple grounds, Tokyo, and the millions throughout the empire who hope to visit there. The story is produced in a score or more of versions on the Japanese stage, and in movies and talkies.... You have to build up for yourself an idea of the mentality of the nation who regard this as the greatest story of their history, and weep over the weather-worn granite tablets in the Sengaku-ji as devout Christians weep over the Passion, or Shiite Moslems over the death of Hossain.

Here Close characterizes the *rōnin* tale as a “sacred scripture,” and adds that it is the holy writ for “patriotic supergangsters” such as Tōyama and the Black Dragon Society. Close also notes how the *rōnin* tale is the subject of school indoctrination for virtually all Japanese youth. Somewhat presciently, Close adds that “This medieval Japanese emotionalism is T.N.T. in the modern world of population pressures, trade wars, international rivalries and naval competition.”⁸⁸ Close never mentions Inoue Tetsujirō, but clearly the ideas that Inoue had and was promoting at the time were among those that Close blamed for Japan’s “hysterical face.”

James Scherer’s *Japan Defies the World*, published in 1938, included a chapter on the Akō *rōnin* incident and its popularity in Japanese culture under the title of “Suicide, On the Stage and Off.” Like Greenbie, Scherer omitted mention of Sokō, but could not help but comment on the prevalence of the *rōnin* mentality in wartime Japan. Unlike Greenbie, Scherer could not muse over the thrilling popularity of the revenge drama; in no uncertain terms, he condemned its pernicious ethical impact on Japanese behavior. Scherer noted that *Chūshingura* was more popular than *Hamlet* or *Macbeth* in England. He observed, for example, that the Sengakuji enclosure housing the gravestones of the *rōnin* is regularly visited by “pilgrims” whose “white votive offerings always cover the mortuary shrine.” He further related that Sir Rutherford Alcock (1809-97), upon visiting Japan in 1858, had mentioned the popularity of the *rōnin* drama, and seriously questioned the effects such a play would have on the local population. Scherer added that eighty years after Alcock, the tale was even more cherished, and amplifying Alcock’s criticism of its implicit ethic, blamed it in part for the prevalence of political assassination, which “was almost always condoned.” Scherer also suggested that the play contributed to the “swashbuckling temper” among Japan’s militarists. In his concluding chapter, “Climax, 1937,” Scherer declared that “fascism [had] been steadily strengthening itself since the February 26 incident” of 1936. It had also strengthened itself via the Manchurian Incident and a host of others, as well as by “keeping alive the story and example of such swashbucklers as the Forty-Seven Rōnin so as to foster suicide as a disciplinary aid for General Araki’s or General Minami’s army.” Scherer then criticized the “pernicious influence” of *Chūshingura* which “spreads the suicide habit until it becomes a national

⁸⁸ Upton Close, *Challenge: Behind the Face of Japan* (New York: Farrar & Rinehart, Inc., 1934), pp. 312-16.

stigma, and condones political assassinations such as the Forty-Seven Rōnin themselves committed.” Recalling the “assassinations casually mentioned in this book,” Scherer concluded that “one cause of Japan’s present distress is that she has no great statesmen left, unless we count Wakatsuki and Shidehara, whose homes have to be kept under heavy guard from the lurking assassin.”⁸⁹ Clearly, Scherer saw the *rōnin* and the kind of behavior they exemplified more as an egregious force undermining the ethics of a nation than as the basis of the same. In this respect, Scherer’s study sharply critiqued Inoue’s views of Sokō, the *rōnin*, and *kokumin dōtoku*.

Maruyama Masao on Fascism and *Kokumin dōtoku*

Given the celebration of Sokō and the *rōnin* in literature dating from 1902 through 1945, it is not surprising that political and military history seems to have mimicked the ideological narrative. Cameron Hurst, for example, has noted,

One of the interesting parallels to the Akō Incident is the February 26 Mutiny of 1926 [*sic.*], right down to the snowfall which blanketed Tokyo on both occasions. In the modern *gishi* incident, members of a radical military faction, claiming ultimate loyalty to the emperor, murdered a number of military and civilian bureaucrats and raised a “righteous rebellion” against what they regarded as misguided policies. Once the rebellion was quieted, the authorities felt an obligation to condemn the rebels to death, since they could not afford to sanction such unlawful activities. But public sentiment clearly lay with the rebels, the purity of whose actions could not be faulted.⁹⁰

Maruyama Masao’s 丸山真男 *Thought and Behavior in Modern Japanese Politics* also suggested, in more general terms, that shadowy *rōnin* type characters epitomized the exploits of Japanese “fascist” groups in the 1930s. Maruyama explained,

What mainly characterizes the formation of the Japanese radical fascist movement from the Blood Pledge Corps Incident until the February Incident is that until the very last its practical managers had no mass organization and showed no particular zeal for organizing the masses. Rather they made it from first to last a movement of a limited number of “patriots.”⁹¹

Maruyama also saw evidence of *rōnin*-like behavior in the May 15 Incident, which he called “the first relatively organized act of violence of radical fascism.” He later added,

The true outlaw type did play an important part in Japanese fascism. But as the name *rōnin* suggests, one of their characteristics was precisely that they did not attain any influential position; instead this eerie gentry operated behind the scenes, scurrying in and out of the offices of the men in power, and receiving an unfixd income in return for such services as they could render. This type of outlaw differed entirely from his

⁸⁹ James A. B. Scherer, *Japan Defies the World* (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1938), pp. 97, 107-16, 255-57.

⁹⁰ Cameron Hurst, “Death, Honor, and Loyalty: The *Bushidō* Ideal,” *Philosophy East & West* 40.4 (October 1990), pp. 525.

⁹¹ Maruyama Masao, “Thought and Behavior Patterns in Japan’s Wartime Leaders,” in *Thought and Behavior in Modern Japanese Politics*, pp. 52-55, 66, 79, 91, 107.

Nazi counterpart.... The men who held supreme power in Japan were in fact mere robots manipulated by their subordinates, who in turn were being manipulated by officers serving overseas and by the right-wing *rōnin* and ruffians associated with the military. In fact the nominal leaders were always panting along in a desperate effort to keep up with the *faits accomplis* created by anonymous, extralegal forces.⁹²

The ample evidence of the prominent roles assigned to Sokō and the Akō *rōnin* in ideological narratives first circulating in, then dominating, Japan between 1902 and 1945, makes it clear that Maruyama's analysis of fascism was, rather than farfetched, most likely informed by familiarity with Inoue's writings and those produced by others who repeated Inoue's thoughts on Sokō and the *rōnin*.

Inoue's *kokumin dōtoku* was one current against which Maruyama explicitly defined his thinking in the essays later published as *Nihon seiji shisōshi kenkyū* 日本政治思想史研究, translated by Mikiso Hane as *Studies in the Intellectual History of Tokugawa Japan*.⁹³ When these essays are read as an implicit critique of Inoue's claims about Sokō and the *rōnin*, some of the seemingly "ahistorical" and perhaps idiosyncratic aspects of Maruyama's work appear not only intelligible but essential expressions of his opposition to Inoue's *kokumin dōtoku*.

H. D. Harootunian has suggested that one byproduct of Maruyama's attempt to impose the theoretical framework developed by Franz Borkenau⁹⁴ on Tokugawa Japan was Maruyama's mischaracterization of Ogyū Sorai as the thinker who liberated the "private" sphere from that of the "public" and stood as the "precursor" of modern consciousness" in Tokugawa Japan.⁹⁵ Harootunian complained that Maruyama's analyses of Sorai seem like "lifeless and formalistic abstractions" because of their "absence of historicity."⁹⁶ Harootunian added that

[f]ar from separating public from private, and creating the conditions for the divided consciousness on which Maruyama's argument hinges, Ogyū feared the worst consequences of such divisions.... His efforts were directed away from accepting the inevitability of a divided consciousness to ways of finding how public and private might be brought together."⁹⁷

Harootunian is correct in noting that Maruyama's account of Sorai is flawed historically. But Harootunian seems to have viewed Maruyama's thoughts on Sorai as the product of a

⁹² Maruyama, "Thought and Behavior," pp. 91-92.

⁹³ Maruyama Masao, *Studies in the Intellectual History of Tokugawa Japan*, transl. Mikiso Hane, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974), pp. xix-xx.

⁹⁴ Franz Borkenau, *Der Übergang vom feudalen zum bürgerlichen Weltbild. Studien zur Geschichte der Philosophie de Manufakturperiode* (Paris: Schriften des Instituts für Sozialforschung, 1934). See Maruyama's "Author's Introduction," p. xxiv, for his thoughts on the relevance of Borkenau for *Studies*. Klaus Kracht, "Traditional and Modern Thought in Japan: Some Notes on the Problem of Continuity and Meaning," in *Tradition and Modern Japan*, ed. P. G. O'Neill (Tenterden, Kent: Paul Norbury Publications, Limited, 1981), p. 56, states that Borkenau "had been the main sponsor of Maruyama's interpretation."

⁹⁵ H. D. Harootunian and Herman Ooms, "Maruyama's Achievement: Two Views," *Journal of Asian Studies* 36.3 (May 1977), pp. 530-31.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 531-32.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 533.

one-dimensional attempt at doing objective intellectual history, one lacking in any sort hidden agenda or allegorical nuance. It seems clear, however, that Maruyama's early writings on Sorai were, if anything, ideological pieces veiled as intellectual historiography.

To prove his "thesis" that Sorai separated the "private" from the "public" arenas, Maruyama cited Sorai's writings on the Akō *rōnin* vendetta. At the time of the vendetta, Sorai was serving Yanagisawa Yoshiyasu 柳沢吉保 (1658-1714), the grand chamberlain to the shogun Tsunayoshi 綱吉(1646-1709). Sorai's writings on the "rightness" (*gi*義) or lack thereof of the *rōnin* are often cited as decisive pieces influencing the *bakufu* decision to sentence the *rōnin* to death by suicide for their egregious violation of the law. Sorai admitted that what the *rōnin* had done might be admirable at the level of private duty and personal opinion. Nevertheless, he insisted that their vendetta was a most serious violation of the public law which should not go unpunished by the authorities. Because the *rōnin* were samurai, they were allowed to commit *seppuku*. But the integrity of public law demanded that they be punished.⁹⁸

In discussing Yamaga Sokō, Maruyama never mentioned his supposed impact on the *rōnin*. By remaining silent on that theme, one of the most frequently repeated in pre-1945 historico-ideological literature, Maruyama was implicitly vetoing Inoue's highly successful attempt to legitimize the model of the vengeful *rōnin*, albeit as it could be transferred to the imperial throne, as a paradigm of *kokumin dōtoku*. Moreover, in lauding Sorai's separation of "private" and "public," Maruyama was delivering an implicit critique of the *rōnin* and, by extension, Inoue's efforts at apotheosizing them. After all, if Maruyama's analysis of the evidence is credible, Sorai effected the separation of "private" and "public" in an essay otherwise siding with the law and emphasizing the illegal nature of their vendetta.

If Maruyama's opposition to Inoue on this issue seems circuitous, that probably resulted from his knowledge that, seventy odd years earlier, Fukuzawa Yukichi 福沢諭吉 (1835-1901), had encountered an unprecedented barrage of criticism, as well as numerous personal threats, for having suggested in *Gakumon no susume* 学問の勧め that the *rōnin* and other *chūshin gishi* died "like stubborn dogs" (*inuji* 犬死).⁹⁹ Fukuzawa's

⁹⁸ Maruyama, *Studies in the Intellectual History of Tokugawa Japan*, pp. 72-76, 102-10. Tahara Tsuguo, *Akō shijūrokushi ron* 赤穂四十六士論(Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1978), pp. 65-69, questions the authenticity of Sorai's *Giritsusho* 擬律書. As proof of Sorai's separation of the private and public arenas, Maruyama's *Studies* cited the latter, which notes that the *rōnin* might have been admirable at the level of private discourse (*shi no ron* 私の論), but not that of public discourse (*kō no ron* 公の論), i.e., the legal level. There can be little doubt that Sorai did not approve of the *rōnin* vendetta. Yoshikawa Kōjirō's (1904-80) 吉川幸次郎 "Sorai gakuan" 徂徠学案 in Ogyū Sorai 荻生徂徠, *Nihon shisō taikai*, vol. 36, ed. Yoshikawa and Maruyama Masao (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1973), pp. 643-44, cites another essay by Sorai, "Shijūshichishi no koto o ronzu" 四十七士の事を論ず (On the forty-seven samurai) declaring the *rōnin* inferior to a peasant loyalist named Ichibei who remonstrated with the *bakufu* until its unjust treatment of his master was reversed.

⁹⁹ "Gakumon no susume no hyō" 学問の勧めの評, in *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū* 福沢諭吉全集 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1958-71), vol. 1, pp. 40-41. Inoue criticized Fukuzawa's *Gakumon no susume* discussion of *chūshin gishi* as a "radical argument" (*kyokutan na giron* 極端の議論).

troubles had erupted in a far less ideologically charged political environment. For Maruyama to have been much more explicit in opposing such a well known element of *kokumin dōtoku* might have cost him dearly. It seems that Maruyama's celebration of Sorai's thinking on the "public/private" issue served as an opportunity for him not to expound Sorai's thinking on the topic rightly but to register his opposition, via supposedly reiterating Sorai's views, to Inoue's elevation of the *rōnin* as ethical role models. Implicitly, Maruyama was declaring a popular element of *kokumin dōtoku* a capital offense, however admirable some thought it to be.

Full appreciation of the ideological significance of Maruyama's elevation of Sorai requires an understanding of pre-1945 attitudes toward and assessments of Sorai as a scholar. Even during the eighteenth century, Sorai was criticized for his infatuation with Chinese language, literature, and philosophy, and for his seemingly absurd call for learned Japanese to read and write in the unpunctuated script of ancient classical Chinese as though they were contemporaries of Confucius himself. In the early twentieth century, Sorai's sinophilia earned him even more criticism, especially as Japanese national pride *vis-à-vis* China soared following the Sino-Japanese War. Similarly, during the eighteenth century Sorai was sometimes criticized for referring to the *bakufu* via honorific terms which had been exclusively used in reference to the imperial court. However, such usage was not particularly problematic in Tokugawa Japan; indeed, the *bakufu* was probably flattered by the references. Following the end of samurai rule and the restoration of imperial government, Sorai's choice of words seemed exceptionally inappropriate, at least to anyone concerned with expressing respect for the emperor and his government. It is hardly surprising, given Sorai's relative respect for China and seeming disrespect for the imperial throne, that he was not granted posthumous rank and title as were a host of Tokugawa scholars, including Sokō, in the prewar years.¹⁰⁰ By extolling Sorai, Maruyama's intellectual historiography thus took a stand antithetical to that advocated by those defining an ideological ethic for the imperial state and its military exploits.

Apart from rather allegorical works such as Maruyama's *Nihon seiji shisōshi kenkyū*, Japanese intellectuals offered relatively few protests against and little organized resistance to the war effort. When the role of Professor Inoue is considered, it is clear that at least one educator at the highest level energetically served the nationalist, imperialist, and militarist efforts of those dominating the state and society. While much has been made recently of the supposedly nationalistic, and perhaps even fascist, inclinations of Kyoto University philosophers such as Nishida Kitarō 西田喜太郎 (1870-1945),¹⁰¹ if the latter are compared to those of Professor Inoue, it is evident that Inoue

Inoue Tetsujirō, *Meiji tetsugakukai no kaiko* 明治哲学界の回顧 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1932), p. 22. Significantly, Inoue's terse pronouncements on Fukuzawa were echoed in other works published the same year: in Nagayoshi Jirō's *Nippon bushidō shi*, p. 278, criticized Fukuzawa's *Gakumon* for its "radical" attack on *chūshin gishi*.

¹⁰⁰ See Maruyama, "Ogyū Sorai no zōi mondai" 荻生徂徠の贈位問題, in *Kindai Nihon no kokka to shisō—Ienaga Saburō kyōju taikan kinen ronshū* 近代日本の国家と思想：家永三郎教授退官記念論集 (Tokyo: Mishōdō, 1979).

¹⁰¹ See James W. Heisig and John C. Maraldo, eds., *Rude Awakenings: Zen, the Kyoto School, and the Question of Nationalism* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1994). Also see, Graham Parkes, "The Putative Fascism of the Kyoto School and the Political Correctness of the Modern Academy," *Philosophy East and West* 47.3 (July 1997), pp. 305-36. Also, Tetsuo Najita

was by far one of the most overtly and aggressively nationalistic, militaristic, and imperialistic ideologues emerging from the academic arena in the first half of the twentieth century. By comparison, Nishida's writings and those of the Kyoto school were at worst mild and ideologically inconsequential.